SEMINARY OF THE EAST LIBRARY
3 0513 40019 0977

Denver Seminary Washington DC Extension
c/o First Baptist Church of Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414

THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES.

VOL. IV.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/historyofnewtest0000drah

C. B. S. E.

A HISTORY

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.

BY

DR. A. HAUSRATH,

ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG.

THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES.

VOL. IV.

TRANSLATED, WITH THE AUTHOR'S SANCTION, FROM THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION, BY

L. HUXLEY, B.A.

WITH A PREFACE BY MRS. HUMPHRY WARD.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,

14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH;
AND 7, BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

1895.

H376
V. 4

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON,
178, STRAND.

CONTENTS.

Fourth Division.

Activity among the Greeks (*continued*).

	PAGE
4. Disturbances at Corinth	3
5. The First Epistle to the Corinthians	28
6. The Struggle over the Apostolate	42
7. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians	55

Fifth Division.

Nero.

1. The New Régime	73
2. The Situation in Judæa	89
3. Paul in Judæa	105
4. Christian Persecution in Judæa	127

Sixth Division.

Paul in Rome.

1. The Apostle's Journey	139
2. The Jews in Rome	146
3. The Roman Christians	156
4. Persecution of the Christians under Nero	168
5. The End of Nero	177

Seventh Division.

The Jewish War.

PAGE

1. The First Insurrection 187
2. Annas and Josephus 200
3. The War in Galilee 212
4. The Fall of Jerusalem 228
5. History of the Christians during the Jewish War . . 246
6. The Apocalypse 256

Index 283

Fourth Division.

ACTIVITY AMONG THE GREEKS.

(CONTINUED.)

ACTIVITY AMONG THE GREEKS.

(CONTINUED.)

4. Disturbances at Corinth.

Paul had quitted Corinth at a moment when a great civic and political revolution loosened every tie, while the intensification of the general expectancy urged religious excitement yet higher. A long-looked-for change of government had taken place. In October, 54, a physician, skilled in poisonous drugs, aided Agrippina to remove Claudius in favour of Nero, now seventeen years of age. The magnitude of the crisis explains the intensity of apocalyptic feeling prevailing in the churches of Macedonia and Achaia. It may even account in part for the rapidity with which Paul's preaching of the approaching day of judgment penetrated Achaia. For since the beginning of the year 54 A.D., the Roman world lay in fearful expectancy. Gone were the hopeful times in which the accession even of a Caligula was greeted with confident acclamation. The heralds of Nero's reign were hideous portents and universal depression.

We have seen in Thessalonica the form taken by this universal excitement in the little Christian circles. The same must have been the case in Corinth. The only class in a comfortable frame of mind were the God-forsaken Roman aristocracy, for whom the hour of judgment had actually come. Gallio, the proconsul of Achaia, said mockingly that Claudius' elevation to Olympus was now effected with a hook;[1] while his brother Seneca seized the opportunity to ridicule the apotheosis of the Cæsars, giving a minute description of the translation of the

[1] Dio Cass. lx. 35.

wretched Claudius, who had been poisoned with a pumpkin. It was an apocolocynthosis, not an apotheosis; pumpkinification, not deification; and the reception in Olympus was depicted agreeably to this introduction.

This was the moment, nearly a year after the accession of the new emperor, when Paul left Corinth. A personality such as his is not merely of importance when actually engaged in affairs; the clearest measure of his influence is the gap made by his absence. So it was here. The mere fact of Paul's departure from Corinth at a time of such excitement had special drawbacks for the church, whose members almost immediately passed into a state of exaltation. In addition, the founders of the church one and all went their way, and the church found itself deserted. With Paul and Aquila went Silas and Timothy, if they had not gone already to Macedonia, where we repeatedly meet with them.

The Corinthians, therefore, made repeated and urgent demands for the return of Paul, who continually puts them off with promises for the future.[1] Instead of him, there came, unfortunately for all concerned, a succession of strange teachers, attracted by the reputation of Corinth, that "epistle known and read of all men."[2] First came the Alexandrian Apollos, soon followed by men of Palestine, some with great respect for Peter, others proud in the consciousness of having known Jesus Christ in person. Before long, a whole series of itinerant teachers had entered the church, either in transit or to stay. All claimed to wield authority over the church.[3] "Many teachers, much strife," were the words of Hillel the elder; and in Corinth, at all events, his words came true. Paul had no cause to rejoice in the thousand and one instructors who assumed an interest in his children.[4] He warns every man that built wood, hay or stubble, on this foundation, which he himself had laid as a wise master-builder, to consider how much of all they so busily erected would survive

[1] 2 Cor. i. 17.
[2] 2 Cor. iii. 2.
[3] 1 Cor. ix. 12.
[4] 1 Cor. iv. 15.

the flames on the day of the Lord; nay, they themselves, he declares, shall be saved with difficulty, and only as by fire.[1]

For his own part, while working in Corinth, he had stooped lovingly to the level of the members of the church, who, in their labours in the warehouses of the city or the wharves of Schœnus, needed other things than the hair-splitting of the Jewish or the lofty speculations of the Greek schools. "I could not speak unto you," he says, "as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it."

But those that came after him were men of a very different stamp. They were skilled to express the subtleties of the Rabbis and the philosophizings of the latest science of religion, and the average man is usually most impressed by what he only half understands. The great danger in the continual introduction of new views, new conceptions, new attitudes of mind, was that the congregations might become estranged from the true end of edification, and turn into an arena of rhetorical exercises and scholastic disputations, transforming Christian activity from a life of love to endless talk. In Corinth, indeed, this danger was greater than elsewhere, for the true Greek found talking the greatest pleasure in life.[2]

But besides this, another bad habit of Hellenism, the inclination to factious partizanship, could not fail to find all too plentiful material in the confluence of so many foreign teachers. To enjoy several masters is not granted to the Greek; he must love one and hate the others; he would not believe in the sincerity of his love if he were not a partizan of the object of his preference, seeking to overthrow all his rivals. Thus strife and wrangling entered the church, often to turn shamelessly against the Apostle. At this juncture it is very possible that Paul dismisses a vexed question with the words: "If any man be

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 15.

[2] Jos. Bell. Procem. 5. Similarly, Cicero, Pro Flacco, 4, 5.

ignorant, let him be ignorant;" or, "If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God."[1]

Thus we see a troubled time of discord following soon upon the times of early love. The impulse grew weaker; the powers of the natural man began to stir again. For all that springs from enthusiasm first foams up for a while and then grows turbid; it is long before returning clearness decides the value of the first seething and ferment. So it was here.

Through the supremacy of genius over smaller minds, Paul had at Corinth brought a number of persons under the law and norm of his religious thought; he had snatched them from their ancient connection with the venerable synagogue, or the more cheerful worship of the Greek temple; he had taken them from the bustling life of a great city to the quiet of a private house; after setting enmity, according to the Lord's saying, between members of a household—between father and son, mother and daughter, the wife and her mother-in-law[2]—he had gone away, and consoled them in their isolation by leaving them a book, a gospel, and the hope of a coming kingdom. Such is the unpitying sternness of universal history, which does not inquire into the minor interests of heart and home. But individuals do inquire into them. It is not astonishing, therefore, that after the Apostle's departure many were in perplexity over the reason of their being brought out of Egypt, and began to murmur over the chimerical dreams with which they had been deluded.[3]

Indeed, the position of this little band was difficult enough. A vivid picture of their life confronts us in the pages of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. There are slaves doubly oppressed by their chains since hearing of the Christian's freedom, since the opening of their eyes to see the foulness of Gentile domestic

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 38, xi. 16. Pointedly also in Cicero: Græcus testis cum ea voluntate procedit, ut lædat .... Vinci, refelli, coargui putat esse turpissimum. Pro Flacco, iv. 5.

[2] Matt. x. 35.

[3] 1 Cor. x. 7—10, 12.

life in which they remain involved. The chief thing that the great revolution should bring them was liberty. "Freemen of Christ" was the name regularly given them now by the Apostle; but how could they be contented with Christ's ransom of their souls only from the yoke of sin? Their every thought and endeavour was concentrated upon gaining a more tangible liberty than what Paul intended. Thus the gospel of the coming kingdom had but intensified their impatience and made their situation more intolerable.[1]

Beside them stand others with similar complaints. There are widows on the look-out for husbands, wives who feel degraded by intercourse with their Gentile husbands,[2] others who are repelled by unbelieving husbands, yet cling to them in the love which believes all, and hopes all, and trusts all, and will not leave them in spite of Paul's warning: "What knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband?"[3] There are anxious fathers afraid of their Christian brethren if they give their daughters in marriage, and equally afraid of their Gentile kinsmen if they refuse to do so.[4]

He who came to bring, not peace, but a sword, had come between them all. The cause that afterwards was to rend the world asunder, began by dividing this little world of slave-rooms and middle-class homes. Paul said truly: "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able."[5] Yet great temptations are not the worst, but the ordinary every-day temptations, and these assailed the church in force. Thus one complaint that strikes us instantly is, that many Christians continue to take part in the worship of idols. Various warnings are given by the Apostle to exclude open idolaters from the church.[6] Mere half-Christians these, who believed at once in monotheism and polytheism, a confusion such as frequently exists in the mind of the common man.

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 21, seq. [2] 1 Cor. vii. 9—14. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 16.
[4] 1 Cor. vii. 25, seq. [5] 1 Cor x. 13. [6] 1 Cor. v. 11, vi. 9, x. 7.

Now the usual reason for participation in idolatry was respect for the family and the desire of living in peace with neighbours. Some, too, who one evening visited the Christian congregation, on the next were impelled to the temple by desire of the sacrificial meals or the common necessities of life. If a neighbour sacrificed a cock to Æsculapius for the recovery of his child, should the Christian appear to hold unsympathetically aloof? If a marriage took place, should he refuse to bring the customary flowers and the kid to the temple of Aphrodite on the Acrocorinthus? It can well be imagined that not every one had the courage to refrain. Many excused their participation on the ground that recognition of the emptiness of heathen worship deprived the visit to the temple of all significance. Whoever held the gods, as they did, to be phantasms, did nothing serious in offering libations and incense, which had no meaning for them. Others did as they pleased, and they composed the majority. In the situation of almost all the members of the church, it was impossible to stand coldly aloof and establish an independent circle within their own household. However firmly convinced that the pagan temples were the dwelling-places of demons who greedily supped up the blood of the victims offered by their pagan friends,—however well aware that in offering their wine and incense at the sacrificial meal they came into contact with the sinister world of demons,—still some were to be seen sitting at meat in the temple-court, because the well-to-do were continually brought there by personal duties, the poor by the prospect of a free dinner.[1] These, too, appealed to the example of stronger characters, but were judged by their own conscience, which accused them of relapsing to the old gods.[2] Whatever the enlightened disciple of Apollos might say,[3] the Jewish Christian believer could see nothing but idolatry in such freedom.

Paul, indeed, passes by the question whether there were not some reality behind these gods of heaven, cloudless Zeus, Apollo and Artemis, or the gods of earth, the wood-gods, fauns, dryads

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 10. [2] 1 Cor. viii. 9, 10. [3] 1 Cor. viii. 1.

and Panisci, and nymphs of grove and fountain. However this may be, he is certain that the devil invented idolatry, and "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God."[1] Now he does not intend his followers to have commerce with devils; whoever sits at the devil's table in the temple of Aphrodite and takes delight in the dances of the hieroduli and their lewdness, shall not come again to the Lord's table and stretch forth his impure hand to the blessed cup.[2]

Justifiable as these ordinances appear to us, they were far from easy to carry out. In a striking simile, Paul compares the strained position of the Christians towards their Gentile surroundings, with the situation of the Israelites after their flight from Egypt, now led into temptation by the daughters of Midian, now by the fleshpots of Egypt, now by the idols of Canaan. He points out that these first disasters in the beginning of their history befel Israel after the flesh as a type and warning for the Israel after the spirit, "upon whom the ends of the world are come." They must not build upon the fact that God has chosen them from amongst all the Gentiles to receive the promise, or that they have been baptized and fed with the bread of life. Those Israelites also were baptized when they passed through the Red Sea and were overshadowed by the cloud, Zimri as well as Phinehas, Korah and his company as well as Joshua and Caleb. These, too, all received the drink of life from the wandering rock, which indeed was simply Christ, and the bread of life in the manna which fell from heaven. But of all so miraculously delivered out of the land of Egypt, how many actually reached Canaan? "With many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness." Those, therefore, who cast longing looks at the forecourts of the temples and regret the free dinners they once enjoyed, receive the warn-

[1] 1 Cor. x. 20. In exactly the same strain the Sibyl, Frag. i. v. 21:

"To Him no lofty hecatombs they bring,
But sacrifice to demons, nether shades."

[2] 1 Cor. x. 21.

ing not to long after the fleshpots of Egypt; for when their forefathers said: "We remember the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers and the melons, and the leeks and the onions, and the garlic;" when they complained, "Who shall give us flesh to eat?" the wrath of Jehovah flashed forth upon them,[1] and they fell from grace. A like warning is given to those who frequent the syssitia and the temple of Aphrodite: "Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play;"[2] nor yet imitate Zimri, who brought the Midianitish woman from the temple of Baal into his tent, and there fell in one day twenty and four thousand.[3] Nor, again, be discontented because the kingdom is so long in coming; for when Israel in their wanderings provoked the Lord by their murmuring, there came fiery serpents and bit the people.[4] Neither murmur at the greatness of the task imposed upon you; for when Israel shrank from the war against the Canaanites, the destroying angel came and smote them again.[5]

The time of trial through which the young church is passing is clearly depicted in this comparison. But this church had also to endure other trials which Jehovah had spared to Israel in their wanderings. Corinth was not the wilderness, but a busy commercial town; manna did not fall from heaven, but must be laboriously gathered, and not seldom from the foulness of the streets. To live here, it was necessary to trade and traffic; but the Apostle gives the name of thievery to the code of honour in Greek commerce. The houses of business in Corinth, the quays of Cenchreæ and warehouses of Schœnus offered a form of occupation which, far from ennobling men like any honest work, drags them down to commonness. Thus some called themselves brethren, though occupied in unspeakable gain and theft, if not in violent robbery.[6]

[1] Num. xi. 5; 1 Cor. x. 6.
[2] Exod. xxxii. 6; 1 Cor. x. 7.
[3] Num. xxv.; 1 Cor. x. 8.
[4] Num. xxi. 4—6; 1 Cor. x. 9.
[5] Num. xiv.; 1 Cor. x. 10.
[6] 1 Cor. v. 11.

There was another danger proceeding from this pettifogging life. Christians defrauded one another; and if a settlement was not arrived at, those who at the last judgment were to judge the heathen and even the angels, were to be seen taking proceedings against one another in the prætorium, and were judged by unbelievers.[1] What sort of impression would it give if, after wrangling over a denarius in the basilica, they saluted one another in the church with the holy kiss? The stern reality of earthly affairs thus made itself felt; those who had dreamed, in the exaltation of a glorious moment, that it would be easy to found the kingdom of God upon earth, learned all too soon that as long as man lives in the body, the law of gravitation drags him downwards.

Such, in its main outlines, was the situation when Paul paid his second visit to Corinth in the year 56-57, in the course of a journey passed over by the Acts. It has been inferred from two spurious passages, Rom. xv. 19 and Titus iii. 12, that this journey took him northwards to Illyria, and that he wintered in Nicopolis, stopping at Corinth on the way.[2] But the Apostle's recollections of this visit were of the saddest,[3] so that, as often as he intended to return, his courage failed him.[4] He had not found the Corinthians as he wished to find them; they in turn found him different from what they wished.[5] His paternal pride was rudely shaken when he revisited the church he had founded a year before. Some there were who clung to both parties, first attending the worship in the temple, and then the congregations of the church.[6] There were others who swore like the Gentiles, went about in places of unspeakable gain, and had even relapsed into theft and robbery.[7] Others indulged in the peculiarly Corinthian vice of drunkenness, and had plunged into every excess of this morally infected city. Scarcely was the first enthusiasm over, scarcely were the exaltation and power of

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 1—8.
[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 7.
[3] Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, 21, xiii. 1, 2.
[4] 2 Cor. ii. 1.
[5] 2 Cor. xii. 20.
[6] 1 Cor. v. 10.
[7] 1 Cor. v. 10, 11.

moral resistance gone in consequence of internal dissension, when the close atmosphere of Corinth, that hot-bed of all impurity, re-asserted its old influence.

Nor did things appear better within the congregations. There the returning Apostle found, as he says, "debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults,"—in short, every form of disorder.[1] Paul had admonished and prayed; he had menaced with miraculous punishments and granted respites;[2] but his authority was broken. He pursued his northward journey disconsolately, lamenting over those "who have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed."[3] One of his first injunctions, therefore, in a letter written before the end of 57, but lost to us, is that the church should "not keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such an one, no, not to sit at the Lord's table at the *agape*."[4] But the Corinthians found it unnecessary thus to purge the church. So far from this, they retorted upon Paul with the ironical question, where they should find any one in Corinth who was altogether free from this taint.[5]

The slightness of the impression made upon the Corinthians by the presence and the categorical demands of the Apostle, can only be explained on the supposition that the other teachers, of whom mention has been made, had meanwhile entered Corinth, and by their influence had neutralized that of the Apostle, without themselves being adequate to maintain sobriety and order in the church. Among these itinerant teachers, who all called themselves apostles and were known as such,[6] none found more responsive hearers in the house of Titius Justus than the Alexandrian Apollos, who had come to Christianity independently. In his case, the impulse towards belief in the kingdom had come from the baptism of John; and though dependent on

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21. [2] 2 Cor. xiii. 2. [3] 2 Cor. xii. 21.
[4] 1 Cor. v. 11. [5] 1 Cor. v. 9. [6] 2 Cor. xi. 13.

others for his belief in Jesus, he had a doctrine of his own.[1] His Alexandrian origin, his special description as being mighty in the Scriptures, and, above all, the taunts uttered by Paul against the rhetorical learning of the synagogue expounded in Corinth by Apollos, prove him to be a follower of the Alexandrian philosophy of religion, which had then found so brilliant an exponent in Philo. In spite of his connection with the Baptist, he was therefore far from being one of the popular prophets who were the order of the day, but a character of distinction in research and knowledge; at once an inquirer and a teacher, such as were afterwards produced in great numbers by this school. Withal he liked to let his talents shine even in the tribune of the synagogue, whence Aquila and Paul, averse to fruitless disputation, had long since retired to their workshops and private gatherings, clearly seeing the futility of further efforts in this direction.[2]

This was the orator in whom Aquila and Prisca thought they recognized the leader so much desired by the church in Corinth; and as this eager student of Alexandria was in any case proceeding to Hellas, the ancient home of light and beauty, they gave him letters of recommendation to their friends at Corinth. This was how Apollos had come here and resumed his activity in the synagogue. Mighty in the Scriptures, versed in every art of Alexandrian exposition, entrusted with the mysteries of the deeper meaning of Scripture,[3] he had fascinated, won over, and kept fast in Christianity many who remained cold before the words of the Tarsian. Many new conversions were effected,[4] and the Jewish circle in the church strengthened by him.[5] While the culture of the Alexandrian schools was thus one weapon on which he relied, he had, on the other hand, another means of producing an impression in the tradition of John's

[1] For the relation of Apollos to the Baptist movement, cf. Keim, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex. i. 183.

[2] Acts xviii. 26, 28.

[3] 1 Cor. ii. 6.

[4] 1 Cor. iii. 5.

[5] Acts xviii. 28.

baptism to repentance and conversion. Since his entry into the church, a great deal was suddenly made of baptism. The whilom disciple of John would seem to have undertaken this sacred office in person with no little pomp. On the banks of Hippocrene, perhaps, in the warm nights of Achaia, he revived the baptism of Jordan, which had once made so deep an impression. Be this as it may, those he baptized plumed themselves greatly upon the advantage of receiving the rite from his hands, looking down upon others with scorn. Paul's older disciples were naturally provoked by this. Paul himself wrote: "I thank God that I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius: lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanus: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me, not to baptize, but to preach the gospel."[1]

But Apollos' own party in the church was not only gained by new conversions and the pomp of his baptism. It was equally due to his display of vigour and energy, contrasting strongly with the frail and weakly figure of the Apostle, who was himself conscious of the disparity between them.[2] But what above all charmed the Greeks was his philosophically trained method of exposition; for the Greeks, according to Cicero, cared not for what one said, but how one said it.[3] Now that a new speaker, to whom both the Apostle and the Acts ascribe great eloquence, had appeared in the synagogue and public places, multitudes of new brethren thronged to the house of Titius Justus, and even numerous disciples of Paul turned to the new light. Even those who were most closely connected with Paul missed the fiery orator when he went on his way; they, too, had grown accustomed to draw warmth from his flame.[4] In the course of a detailed comparison between his own and Apollos' teaching, Paul explains wherein the difference of their methods consists. He indirectly reproaches Apollos with teaching the

[1] 1 Cor. i. 14—17, as an exordium against the party of Apollos.
[2] 1 Cor. ii. 3. [3] Pro Flacco, 4, 5. [4] 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

wisdom of this world, and of the rulers of this world and its guiding spirits;[1] with imparting this wisdom in words which man's wisdom teaches,[2] in excellency of speech framed after a philosophic system,[3] and studied rhetoric.[4] To hear these charges, one cannot but find in Apollos, himself an Alexandrian, a follower of the Alexandrian religious philosophy, that is to say, of Philo. But from the way in which Paul makes the "deceitful, studied words of wisdom" a reproach against him, it must be admitted that he was not content, like Paul, to lay down a consistent doctrine of Christ within the dualistic view of the world, but introduced into the Christian Church high-sounding conceptions of the schools, such as the hidden and the visible God, the Logos and the æons. Thus tricked out, the doctrine of Christ began to awaken interest, not only among believers, but also among unbelievers.[5] The Apostle was but an ignorant tent-maker. "a fool," as he himself says in bitter irony.[6] But, thanks to the activity of Apollos, his disciples were becoming "wise in Christ;"[7] he was without influence, and had effected nothing among the upper classes of society, while they impelled their fellow-citizens by their spiritual pre-eminence, and were already a society of note, whose philosophic significance and political influence are generally recognized.[8]

Apollos had thus started a form of Christianity which effected a compromise with the world, and impressed the Jews by the proof from Scripture, while dallying with Platonism in the double-dealing method of Philo's system. Only a success thus purchased awakens no opposition. In former days we hear much of persecutions at Corinth; now tranquillity reigned anew.[9] Unless, indeed, it is sheer irony on the part of the Apostle, Christianity now actually enjoyed approval and exercised influence. With regard to this, Paul had but one thought: this wisdom of the rulers, who would be deposed and forgotten on

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 6. [2] 1 Cor. ii. 13. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 1, 4.
[4] 1 Cor. i. 17. [5] 1 Cor. iv. 10. [6] *μωρός*.
[7] *φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ*. [8] *ἔνδοξοι, ἰσχυροί*. [9] 1 Cor. x. 13.

the morrow, was not religion. In his eyes, it was no recommendation that the leaders of the age spoke in the church; for when the rulers of this world declared in solemn conclave upon the teachings of Jesus, they rejected him. If the rulers of this world had the slightest understanding of the things of the kingdom of God, they would have been blameless of their worst act, the crucifixion of the Lord of Glory. No doubt many members of the church had themselves made similar reflections, while others flung themselves eagerly into the whirl of discussion.

Thus the opposition between Christians who followed Apollos or Paul soon took the form of rivalry or hot enmity.[1] Instead of all employing one speech and one watchword, every one says for himself who he is, whom he supports, whom he belongs to. Ever since the days of Homer, the Hellene had taken a childish delight in vaunting himself to be the child of a nobler parent and better teacher than any one else. So, too, in these later days, each one, as Paul graphically puts it, puffed himself up against the other for the honour of a third; that is to say, he plumed himself with the name of his spiritual father, Apollos or Paul,[2] in order to appear more important himself. Paul draws a picture of their occupation, not without humour; telling how they appoint a day to sit in judgment and decide whether Paul or Apollos pleases them best.[3] Since Apollos had made the facts of the gospel into objects of rhetoric, critical judgment had taken the place of naive belief. With satiety and weariness began criticism of the form, instead of subjection to the stern discipline of the word. It was as if the goal had already been reached; as if the great step from earthly wretchedness to the Messianic kingdom had already been taken; as if everything needful had been secured, and nothing remained but to judge of the labours of others.[4] In other words, the church of Corinth, following the bent of the Hellenic spirit, designed to become a philosophic school instead of a religious community.

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 3.
[2] 1 Cor. iv. 6.
[3] 1 Cor. iv. 3.
[4] 1 Cor. iv. 8.

Yet Apollos had not given the impulse deliberatey. He himself seems to have been but little edified by the homage paid him. In the year 58, at all events, we find him once more at Ephesus in company with the Apostle, from whom, indeed, we learn that Apollos unhesitatingly rejected every invitation to return to Corinth—a proceeding which may be referred to respect for Paul, as much as to dissatisfaction with Corinthian factiousness.[1] But praiseworthy as Apollos' refusal appears, he had inflicted permanent injury on Corinth. He had armed the contentious Greeks with the weapons of theological controversy; so that even after his departure, the hours of edification were turned from their proper purpose to the discussion of dogmatic controversy.

Such being the situation, it is not hard to see that the first theological discussions turned upon the one great question of the time, which swallowed up all others, the question of the judgment to come and the Messianic kingdom. Now while in Thessalonica the chief anxiety was whether all who had been converted should attain to enjoyment of the kingdom, here Hellenic curiosity raised the question, In what body should a man appear in the resurrection? The inquiry probably proceeded from the followers of Apollos, who, it seems, were urged to deny a resurrection in the flesh by the Alexandrian tendency to spiritualize dogma. Yet not they alone; the Apostle's own disciples in part ranged themselves on this side.[2] To this the opposition to the Judaists may also have contributed. These brought with them everywhere the cruder and coarser conceptions of Palestine, thereby awakening vigorous opposition among the enlightened Greeks. To them, this doctrine of the return of the dead appeared a fancy not to be accepted by any man in his senses.[3] "How," they ask, "are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?"[4] How would they look if they came again withered and shrivelled and corrupted, as they

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 12.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 1—3, 11.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 34.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 35.

were committed to the earth ?[1] The living body has a glory of its own, but the dead are justly covered by the earth. If it be, again, that the departed come into a new body, how shall we with our earthly body exist beside that which the glorified bring with them ?[2]

These were truly questions to prove the quickness of Greek tongues; they acted like a running stream on the clattering mill-wheel of Corinthian volubility. The native Greeks, the old stock of Paul's church, were by nature on the side of criticism. To this extent Paul felt distressed; although, without the spiritualistic dreams of the Alexandrian and the Jewish Christians' crass views of the resurrection of the flesh, the whole quarrel would scarcely have been significant. But it was precisely the Judaists who now reproached Paul[3] with his Greek converts' denial of this, in their eyes, essential presupposition of the preaching of the Messianic kingdom.

By this time we notice the presence of some such Judaistic party in a series of other disputes. Through it, the factiousness of Corinth came to a head. To the partizanship of Greek vanity, Judaism brought the corrosive bitterness of Pharisaic intolerance and dogmatic hatred; and now these solvents completed their work of destruction. Here, then, the story of Galatia is repeated under entirely new and remarkable conditions. A city with so important a Jewish section, and at the same time in constant relations with the churches of Asia Minor, in which this very reaction of the Jewish Christians against Paul's teaching came to a head, must almost of necessity be drawn into the current from Asia Minor. Every day crowds of Jews and Syrians landed at Cenchreæ, among them sometimes, may be, a follower of Jesus, who joined the disciples of Paul and Apollos as a disciple of Peter. Some there were, too, who had seen Jesus himself in Galilee, had looked upon his countenance,

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 43. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 50.

[3] Besides the passages cited, this is proved still more directly by 1 Cor. xv. 9—11.

had heard his voice,[1] and took no little pride in this "manifestation." They were not content, therefore, with being named after Peter; they called themselves the disciples of Christ.[2]

The cause of this strong influx from Palestine lay partly in the distress of the parent church. It was not only that the Dispersion sent money for the poor of Jerusalem; these poor even came to get it in person. For all the fine-sounding names of their sects, for all the dignity of their appearance, many of them had only thought of their call to a mission when a measure of wheat in Palestine cost a denarius, and the people of Jerusalem began to die of hunger. Among them came those itinerant preachers whose first thought was a sufficiency of food, "who devour the churches and take of them." Nevertheless, they were greatly puffed up with having been directly converted by Jesus, and called themselves "of Christ." We shall soon see that their leaders, as the narrow and select circle, turned upon Paul's Apostolate with peculiar acrimony, for they could not possibly recognize the authority of a man who stood in no relation whatever to Jesus.

If these more bitter antagonists were, in overwhelming probability, "those of Christ," another party named themselves in contradistinction after Peter, consisting of those who adopted the view of the apostolic circle, and held the law as binding to a certain extent even upon Gentile Christians. Among these must be reckoned a large number of Jewish Christians, and furthermore, those Greeks who desired tangible duties, and found in the discipline of the Jewish law a barrier against the miserable life of their poorer brethren.

Such variety of points of view and presuppositions, conceivable in any religious community, must have been doubly varied in Corinth, where the factious spirit of the Greek seized upon these antagonisms in order to take sides with every new arrival and enter into his service.[3] This suited the Jew's native love of domination. Just as in Galatia, so here they delighted to

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 6, 12, x. 7. [2] 1 Cor. i. 12. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 17.

revive in a Christian church the dogmatic quarrels usually carried on in the Ghetto with sharp tongues, and later, indeed, with the point of the knife.[1] Once more their chief anxiety was to pull to pieces the character of the Apostle. Some of them had not come to Corinth on private business, but gave themselves out as apostles of Christ, whom they had actually known—a fact on which they based the right of maintenance by the church for themselves and their wives, as well as the receipt of other assistance.[2] The church being unused to this practice on the part of Paul and Barnabas, they put it about that Paul and Barnabas did not venture to exercise this right solely because they knew themselves not to be genuine apostles, no messengers sent by Christ.[3]

The danger from this quarter, of course, still seemed insignificant to the Apostle when he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians.[4] Otherwise he would not have spent all his shafts upon the antinomianism of the church, nor called himself distinctly an abortion, "not worthy of being called an apostle." Who, indeed, would have suspected the impending change? Here was a church whose members were scarcely yet to be kept from worship in the temples, whose whole aim and object was to gain the reputation of a Sophist's school for the house of Titius Justus, many of whose Jewish adherents were so much ashamed of their origin that they sought to remove from themselves the sign of the covenant.[5] How was it possible in a few weeks for such a church to fling itself with true Greek instability into the arms of Judaism?

It became clear soon enough that the restless strangers were already eager to entangle the churches of Achaia in the same way as those of Asia Minor. Indirectly, too, it is clear, from the Epistle to the Corinthians no later than the year 57 or the beginning of 58, that the leaven of the Pharisees had already penetrated the life of the church at every pore, and

[1] Suet. Claud. ii. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 26. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 19, 20.
[3] 1 Cor. ix. 1, seq. [4] Cf. xv. 9, 11. [5] 1 Cor. vii. 18.

poisoned it in every relation. But for the very reason that the healthy nature of the Greeks still reacted strongly, almost too strongly, against this foreign element, Paul perhaps believed that he could venture upon the struggle with his old enemies. Circumcision was indeed demanded; but here it was still in the balance against the inclination of the Jewish Christians to approximate to the Gentiles.[1]

On the other hand, the struggle over the Jewish ordinances concerning meats was renewed in bitter earnest, the Judaists making an outcry against the use of meats offered to idols. The meat exposed for sale at Corinth included some from the sacrificial victims. The god and the priests first took their portion of the offering; the rest was either eaten at the sacrificial banquets in the court of the temple or at home, or was taken to the meat-market and sold. At the great public sacrifices, the temple itself appears to have disposed of the bulk of the meat in this way. In any case, the regulation in question was of great importance to the poorer part of the community, for the sacrificial meat was the cheapest in the market, and it was customary to make presents of it to friends and relations, or to invite them home to partake of it.[2] Considering, indeed, that most great occasions at home were celebrated by a sacrifice, a Christian might have meat offered to idols set before him on the most various occasions, when he assisted to celebrate a friend's return or recovery, or the like, though he in person refrained from visiting the temple. Paul felt no objection to eating such flesh, following the rule of the Psalmist: "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof."[3] He accepted it like any other meat, with thanksgiving to God.

When now the Judaists would prohibit the use of meat offered to idols,[4] a violent quarrel broke out between them and the dis-

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 18. [2] 1 Cor. x. 26. [3] Ibid.

[4] Those who reproach the Apostle with the laxity of his disciples are those who have seen the Lord. They do not consider him an Apostle, but recognize the authority of Peter and the brothers of the Lord, and let them-

ciples of Paul and Apollos, who in part proved their higher insight and advanced philosophic culture by continually setting themselves above this prejudice. Either extreme appeared equally childish to the Apostle. "Meat," he says, "will not commend us to God; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better."[1] But the Corinthians would not have been Greeks if they had not made it a subject of wrangling and hatred and cursing. Remembering this early horror of meats offered to idols in the party of Judaism, afterwards uttered among the Phrygian churches in the "Touch not, taste not, handle not,"[2] we infer a similar feeling from the watchword of others: "It is good for a man not to touch a woman."[3] Clearly, this maxim cannot have proceeded from the followers of Peter, for in our Epistle Paul records how the latter and the rest of the apostles and the brothers of the Lord not only had wives, but took them along with them on their journeys. But possibly one of the points of difference between those of Peter and those of Christ was, that they who boasted of having looked upon the countenance of Christ followed his example of celibacy. In any case, this tendency had early made its appearance in Essene Christianity; for ten years later the author of the Apocalypse reckons 144,000 who have not defiled themselves with women, and therefore hold the first place before the throne of the Lamb.[4]

This question being raised in the Corinthian church after the departure of the Apostle, we shall not be wrong in putting down as disciples of Christ those who introduced these Essene principles. Now began in Corinth the distress of husband and wife over their married life;[5] excitable women proposed to leave their husbands,[6] and widows were looked askance at if they

selves be maintained by the church. They are, therefore, specifically the Judaists, those of Christ. After ix. 1—12.

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 8.
[2] 1 Coloss. ii. 21.
[3] 1 Cor. vii. 1.
[4] Rev. xiv. 4.
[5] 1 Cor. vii. 3; cf. Juv. vi. 535, seq.
[6] 1 Cor. vii. 10.

contracted new bonds.[1] Now women found it doubly intolerable to share the heathen home of their husbands with its defilements; mixed marriages were shaken,[2] while in unmixed marriages a monastic rule of life was insisted on.[3] Virgins were urged to celibacy, and their fathers' conscience appealed to against permitting them to marry.[4] What now appeared in Christian houses through this strongly Oriental and ritualistic Essene tendency, was exactly the matter of dispute which the Roman satirists gibed at in the proselytes of the Egyptian cult. Against this scruple the followers of Paul had the less counsel and confidence, as Paul himself views the question of marriage from the point of the approaching advent of the kingdom. They too, therefore, had exhorted against marriage.

It was but natural that all these practical differences, which undermined the peace of Christian families, found utterance in the congregations. We cannot, therefore, wonder to find the latter at once assume a very stormy character. Where there was so much to discuss, there was an eager struggle for the right of speech, and long addresses from the party of Apollos were of no service to the followers of Peter.[5] A universal and unmeasured desire of speaking broke out among the talkative Greeks. If one was allowed to speak, he profited shamelessly by his opportunity; while others, under the pretext that the spirit moved them, interrupted; so that it often happened that several prophets spoke at once, and the God who here bade his prophets speak appeared to be a God of disorder more than a God of peace.[6]

This egoism of oratory undoubtedly was more apparent in Apollos' school, the school of fine words. What was far worse was, that Syrians and Palestinians introduced into these churches to which they had obtained admission the forms of ecstasy, the disordered piety and Bacchic environment of the Syrian Christians; for in them this kind of paroxysm was

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 8. [2] 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 5.
[4] 1 Cor. vii. 36. [5] 1 Cor. xiv. 31. [6] 1 Cor. xiv. 29—33.

not of native growth, and being devoid of inward reality, immediately became exaggerated. For the fact that the excesses of speaking with tongues had only just been introduced into the church, is proved by the evident astonishment of the Apostle to find it here.[1] Well as he knew this ecstatic condition, and felt in it the stirring of the spirit, he never did and never would allow it to be made an element of public edification.[2] At the foundation of the church, doubtless, in the times of the first enthusiasm, some of the storm of his feelings had been spent, so that now he only gave utterance to his excess of feeling in broken tones.[3] But that now the whole congregation often assumed the fanatical appearance of prophesying, shouting and wailing enthusiasts, was due to a drop of Syrian blood in the veins of this Greek church, for which Paul was in no way responsible.[4] Indeed, he himself depicts the new aspect of the church with a half-ironical astonishment—this "speaking into the air," this senseless din, these confused noises and inarticulate tones, as of pipes, harps, trumpets, drums and cymbals; this passing into the alien sound of "barbarous speech;" this new language, distinguishable from the seventy known languages by the fact of having no words,—these and all the other similes of the Apostle in part betray his indignation, in part his scorn.[5] As opposed to the Apostle's doctrine of the gifts of the spirit, the belief that the Holy Spirit could only be felt in these wild sallies of ecstasy, shows how far removed the true view of the new principle, its nature and manifestation, was from the church.[6] He who plunged into this turmoil believed himself to receive the grace of the spirit, and looked down superciliously on the rest; he who never felt moved to speaking with tongues, shouting, sighing and groaning, imagined that the spirit of Christ was not in him, and was troubled about his election.[7] It was precisely

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 1, xiv. 6, 20. [2] 1 Cor. xiv. 19. [3] 2 Cor. xii. 12.
[4] 1 Cor. xiv. 23. [5] 1 Cor. xiv. 6—25. [6] 1 Cor. xii. 15, seq.
[7] 1 Cor. xii. 15—20 is written to console these, as chap. xiii. to put down spiritual pride.

the most genuine amongst them who could feel anxiety whether they belonged to the mystical body of Christ, as they could give no clear sign of the inspiration of his spirit. The rest also accounted them unhonoured members,[1] if not actually refusing to include them at all among the "spiritual."

But while men thought themselves nearer God in ecstasy than in rational speech and action, phenomena occurred in these scenes of excitement which must have puzzled the most ardent believers. Amid the senselesss turmoil, some felt compelled to curse what the church held most sacred. The congregations of Christians actually heard raised among them the shocking cry of Anathema Jesu, once raised by the mob of the synagogues in the sack of Christian houses.[2] This was no longer the pure inspiration of the tongues of Jerusalem. Paul himself, whom the Corinthians told of the fact in horror, warns them not to relapse into the old spiritual bondage of heathen prophecy. The pious frenzy of the priest of Cybele, with its blind riot and irresponsible ravings, ill becomes the devout house of a Christian congregation. Yet what else is this headlong ecstasy, which does and says things that clear sense would not hesitate to condemn? Natives of Palestine and Syria, doubtless, would find nothing new in these stormy meetings, only ended by sheer exhaustion;[3] but here in Corinth they came upon dangerous ground. The wreck of order and decency involved in this excitement led to other excesses, such as had never before occurred in any Christian community.[4]

The Greek women, who certainly had long taken a different place in society from the women of Syria, permitted themselves conduct in the Christian assemblies such as had never before been seen. When once the bonds of custom were broken, they

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 12—27.

[2] The Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 1) inquired of Paul concerning this strange phenomenon (xii. 3): xii. 2 refers to it. It is inconceivable to suppose that Paul himself invented this phrase as an example, or uttered it spontaneously.

[3] Acts ii. 6, xxi. 9, seq.

[4] 1 Cor. xi. 16, xiv. 36.

too gave themselves up to the guidance of the spirit. As every individual cried aloud the words that flashed across his mind, they in their turn gave free course to their stream of words, in obedience to the belief that a higher power was beating and working so vehemently in their hearts. Moreover, in view of the astounding destiny which had singled them out to be raised above the daily round of life, the expectation of the great things which were to happen through them and for them, gave rise among the women to a vivid spirit irreconcilable with the rigid subjection of the woman to the man.[1] With their conversion, they felt that some change had taken place in their relation to men. Here, on the level of religious life, they were conscious of equal rights with the men. They therefore desired not to be condemned to sit silent and thickly veiled in the church at least. When the usage of the synagogue of speaking with covered head was given up in the church, the women too threw off the veil which formerly concealed them modestly from the masculine eye, and at the same time was a sign of their subservient position.[2] Unveiled, such as was the fashion of hetæræ alone, they met with men to contribute their own inspiration and experiences to the church. It cannot be doubted that such a proceeding was in highest degree offensive to the Syrians, accustomed as they were to strict seclusion of their women. Nevertheless, even this excess was closely connected with the exaltation to which none had contributed so much as themselves.

While the assemblies of the church thus sank in esteem, the same change passed over the rite of the common love-feasts. Here, above all, it is clear that the noise of the latest development was not based upon the abundance of moral inspiration, but that the Apostle was perfectly right in opposing the life in love to the speaking with tongues of men or angels. In spite of the exaltation of the assemblies, the members of the church had grown cold within, and were estranged, and in part inimical to one another. In these circumstances the love-feast became an

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 34, xi. 3. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 10.

empty form, which would have been better abolished, for, in Paul's judgment, the people only met "to become worse."[1] By this time party divisions had widened so far, that there was no longer any question of the common nature of the meal. Under the pretext that they were hungry and could not wait,[2] each consumed what he brought with him. The rich supped well, the poor sat hungry: while some took the opportunity of drinking too much.[3] Those who had been accustomed to receive a meal here, now slunk away home ashamed.[4] They at least did not carry home the emotions for the sake of which such meetings had been established. They had become, not better, but worse. The Apostle of course gives these impressions with some reserve.[5] Complaints had come to him through the slaves of Chloe, who had now gone to Ephesus. Like all the poor, they were greatly incensed against the behaviour of the rich, and were themselves a party.[6] Yet there were splendid exceptions.[7] Paul was well aware, from the occurrences of Thessalonica, that the poor had sometimes abused the ordinance of the *agapes* in order to be maintained by the well-to-do. But whatever the rich had to say in self-defence, the ideal and the real were all too strongly contrasted at these "love-feasts." Where was now the fire of that first love which, scarce twenty years before, had made the Christians put all their goods in common and inaugurated the name of brethren? The bad impression made by this love-feast without love was accentuated by the fact that this scene of disorder was followed immediately by the Eucharist, which some partook of full or drunk, others with their hearts full of envy. So one took the holy bread to assuage his hunger, another drank the wine when he had already confused his brains by drinking, making no distinction between this and any other bread and wine.[8]

On every side, then, there had been a grievous falling away from the original idea of church institutions, to a degree he had

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 17. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 33, 34. [3] 1 Cor. xi. 21.
[4] 1 Cor. xi. 22. [5] 1 Cor. xi. 18. [6] Ibid.
[7] 1 Cor. xi. 19. [8] 1 Cor. xi. 29.

never imagined possible. There was some sense of this in the church itself, manifested in a request for a visit, now from Apollos,[1] now from Paul,[2] now from one of the Palestinian leaders.[3] One thing, at all events, the Corinthians did not conceal from themselves, the need of a strong hand to regulate their affairs.

---

5. The First Epistle to the Corinthians.

The situation of his principal church, as drawn by Paul, gives a clue to the tone of censure towards the several Pauline churches adopted by the Apocalypse, which was sent to them as a circular letter. We see here in detail what the prophet figuratively calls the teaching of Balaam and the works of the Nicolaitans, and what is the meaning of his complaint: "I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead." Our Apostle, however, expresses himself more gently, maintaining his capacity to see the good beside the evil, though there were much evil. The field which Paul had tilled and Apollos watered, bore fruit like a plot where weeds had overgrown the good seed. But the good seed was not entirely choked, the best proof of which is the epistle addressed to Paul by the Corinthians in the year 57 or 58, the substance of which we can learn from Paul's reply.

Tares and full ears of corn grew there side by side. Beside the most unmeasured libertinism was the tenderest consideration of unselfish love and strict conscientiousness;[4] beside hard-hearted selfishness, renunciation delighting in sacrifice.[5] The Apostle's eye was so formed, however, that he saw the good before the evil, and let his look rest upon it by preference. Yet this did not prevent him from laying bare every wound with a

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 12. [2] 1 Cor. xvi. 5.
[3] 2 Cor. xi. 4. [4] Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 13—18 with vii. 16.
[5] Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 31 with xvi. 15.

tender hand. His Epistle to the Corinthians, written shortly before Easter 58,[1] is a fine memorial of his pure character, his supreme knowledge of men and experience, sparing or striking exactly as was right. In estimating it, the first consideration of importance is, that other notice had already been taken of the abuses which had crept in, both in writing and by word of mouth. On the occasion of his visit to Corinth "in passing," Paul had already addressed himself in earnest to the purification of the church, and threatened to extend no mercy to the impure elements of the church on his return.[2] In the same spirit he had demanded the excommunication of notorious sinners in one of the letters written on his journey.[3] But the Corinthians, spoiled by the demonstrative and pathetic addresses of the new teachers, were unable to perceive the deep earnest of the Apostle's spirit under his mild entreaties. The bluster and declamation which had lately spread amongst them,[4] had rendered the church incapable of distinguishing moral earnestness from empty clatter. On the former occasion they had found Paul modest, even humble; now they did not know how to take the stinging letter which had come since his departure. So for a while the old state of things continued.[5]

Paul now commissioned Timothy, who was working in Macedonia, to inspect matters afterwards at Corinth, and, in view of the dogmatic disputes, to explain "even as Paul taught in every church."[6] Moreover, he had no fears about his disciple being equal to the task. "Now if Timothy come, see that he be with you without fear; for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do: let no man, therefore, despise him. But set him forward on his journey in peace."[7]

Such was the Apostle's anxiety when he bade his companion take the troublous way to Corinth; in fact, after Paul had set

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. v. 6—8 with xvi. 8.
[2] 2 Cor. xiii. 2.
[3] 1 Cor. iv. 9.
[4] 1 Cor. iv. 19, 20.
[5] 2 Cor. x. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 9.
[6] 1 Cor. iv. 17.
[7] 1 Cor. xvi. 10.

the impure elements a term for improvement until his return,[1] he was expected there in person. When his coming was delayed, some at once began to puff themselves up, as though he would never return. All that Paul could do was to repeat by letter that he would soon come and try, not the eloquence, but the strength, of those who thus puffed themselves up. "For the kingdom of God," he cries to the declaiming leaders of faction, "is not in word, but in power." At the same time, he turns again to his higher power of punishment: "What will ye? Shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love and a spirit of meekness?"[2]

But if the Corinthians now boasted that Paul no longer trusted himself near their superiority, their pride must have swelled still higher when he announced the coming of Timothy instead of himself, and actually claimed their consideration for him. In fact, the Apostle now had double reason to be concerned for his "beloved child." Their letters had crossed. Paul had already ordered Timothy to Corinth when he met at Ephesus Chloe, the Corinthian lady whose household included three members of the church there, Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus.[3] These had been commissioned by the Corinthians to invite Apollos over;[4] at the same time, they brought with them the above-mentioned letter of the church to Paul—a letter which the Apostle now answered in our First Epistle to the Corinthians.[5]

In the first place, Paul felt no little refreshed and strengthened by the presence of these excellent representatives of the Corinthian church. Amongst them was the first convert he made in Achaia, the first whom he had baptized with all his house.[6] So these three reminded him of the earlier times of love; and when he took up his pen, he was inclined to see the church itself in these men, despite all subsequent experiences.

[1] 2 Cor. xiii. 2.
[2] 1 Cor. iv. 18.
[3] 1 Cor. i. 11, xvi. 15, 17.
[4] 1 Cor. xvi. 12.
[5] 1 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 1, xi. 2, &c.
[6] 1 Cor. xvi. 17, i. 16.

He desired them to have authority, and, judging from his intercourse with them, expected the best results for the Corinthians.[1]

What he felt most severely in the account of Chloe's people, and what he spoke of first, was the party spirit which had crept in. With wonderful insight he sees through this factiousness, and applies the lash of his irony to the assemblies of the church, in which each clique puffs itself up to favour its leader, and credits him with having the best following.[2] He hits off these parties, with their practice of extolling those who share their opinions and thus mutually maintaining their importance. But how narrow the purview of these Corinthians has grown, since they have grown habituated to consider everything with reference to its utility to party, to reject everything that has not a ring of Apollos or Peter, to associate with none, to accept nothing, nor admit its value, unless connected with their own coterie. Such is the point of view to which the Apostle resorts in our Epistle against the petty rivalries of Corinthian parties.[3] He shows the Corinthians that they rate their possessions far too low; that they renounce the best means for their development which God lays before their feet, because each individual finds good that only which his teacher can offer; and that consequently they block up their horizon, they cut away the root of all growth with their own hands. That is a true utterance from the warm heart of the Apostle to the Gentiles: "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours."[4] And this partizanship is no more worthy of himself than of the Corinthians. It is true, as they say, that he did not come forward in Corinth with the self-assurance of an applauded Sophist. He came forward in weakness, in fear, and much trembling; but what he wanted was, not their applause, but obedience to God. All true evangelists are God's fellow-workers,

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 18.
[2] 1 Cor. iv. 6.
[3] 1 Cor. iii. 16—iv. 17.
[4] 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23.

and will receive their reward from God; they did not serve for the thanks of the church.[1]

The Apostle does not therefore think fit to enter upon the perversities of the various sections in detail. He only lays it down clearly to the followers of Apollos that they have gone utterly astray if they give worldly wisdom and knowledge the decisive voice in matters of faith. There are powers and depths of the human mind for religion to appeal to, other than those to which knowledge appeals. The wisdom which the gospel brings, comes into being by a very different process from that of the wisdom of this world, telling what ear has never heard nor eye beheld, things that do not reach to the heart by the way of sensuous perception, but are a revelation of the spirit from the spiritual world. The Sophists will pour their scorn upon this heaven-taught wisdom, and the lawyers of the synagogue will be wroth over it so long as they remain what they are, earthy creatures, without a sense for the spiritual world. What good is it, therefore, to compress the gospel into a shape after the manner of this world, for it is always folly to the wise?

The preaching shall not be directed to these, but to the simple, artless faith of the heart. For Christ is divine power, divine wisdom, to those alone who draw near with faith, and not with understanding. In him, they find saving support; in him, the solution to every riddle of existence. This fact at least stands out clearly before the Apostle as the result of the last twenty years. Look round upon the ranks of the church of God. "Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world?" The wise men of Jerusalem crucified the Lord of Glory; the philosophers of Achaia turned their scorn upon him. "God hath made foolish the wisdom of the world. God chose the foolish things that He might put to shame them that are wise: and God chose the weak things of the world that He might put to shame the things that are strong, and the things

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 5.

that are not that He might bring to nought the things that are."

The lower classes of society—the small folk "who are nothing," who are disregarded—are those for whom the great revolution of the world is left. Indeed, the Apostle has the clearest possible insight that the new development rising from below, will lead far beyond all the glories of old, beyond all Roman power and Greek wisdom. He hears at the door already the steps of the bearers who are to carry out these wise men. The squabbles of the schools, the catchwords of philosophies which now fill the world, will all be silenced to-morrow. "Howbeit we speak wisdom; yet a wisdom not of the rulers of this world, which are coming to nought;" these are Paul's words, not in later days, after history pronounced its verdict, not after the academies of Alexandria were closed, and the temple of Diana at Ephesus was surmounted by the cross, but at a time when a handful of slaves and petty burghers constituted the Christian Church, while all that lays claim to wisdom, culture and morality, crowded to the lecture-rooms of the Academy, and the cry of the multitude, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" still rang in the Apostle's ear. It was the unerring premonition of genius, for which the future prophetically becomes the present.

One measure at least Paul had at hand; he thought the time was now run out. It was his universal practice to refer everything to the day of the Lord, who stands at the door and knocks. So now he asks the Corinthians if they meant to trick themselves out before Christ's judgment-seat with choice cullings from Philo's system, or appeal to their art in holding forth like Apollos. In his opinion, their latest progress is as "wood, straw and reeds," consumed by the flames of the day of judgment. On the other hand, all that a teacher has established of lasting faith and love and moral firmness will abide on that day, when all arts of speculation and tawdry rhetoric will fall from us like dross.[1] At the same time, the Epistle does not proceed without

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 11—15.

a backward glance at the condition of the church in its earliest days, while a few ironical remarks upon the wealth of wisdom that has so suddenly come upon the excellent Corinthians, do not fail to strike home. Equally drastic is the impression made by the Apostle when, to put down Corinthian conceit, he draws up a long indictment of their immoral principles and actions, which display the church in a most deplorable light. In view of such facts, he feels himself compelled to moderate the demands he was inclined to make upon the life of the Christians. His principle indeed is, that "it is good for a man not to touch a woman;" but he had no wish to make it the foundation for the righteousness by works of Essene asceticism, still less to lend support to irregular and sensual living. It was only because he considered the remaining task of mankind was to prepare for the approaching advent of the Lord, that he was unable to understand how any one who seriously expected this advent could find time and inclination to enter into the bonds of matrimony; for "the time is shortened, that henceforth those that have wives may be as though they had none."[1]

Marriage seemed to him not worth while for the present, and a mere hindrance to the preparation for the great future. "He that is unmarried is careful for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married is careful for the things of the world, how he may please his wife."[2] Besides, the advent of the Lord will be ushered in by great famine and tribulation, in which the unmarried will suffer less than the married. It was to save them, therefore, says the Apostle, that he warned them against marriage.[3]

But how little he commends that Essene horror of marriage which arouses physical repulsion, is shown by his earnest admonitions to those wives who were infected by these principles, and in their hysterical passion were ready to give up their husbands to the temptations of Satan.[4] Those also who, imagin-

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 29.
[2] 1 Cor. vii. 32.
[3] 1 Cor. vii. 28.
[4] 1 Cor. vii. 5.

ing themselves misunderstood by Gentile husbands, had entered upon a formal separation under the influence of the same excitement, he bids to humble themselves before their husbands and seek reconciliation with them.

Now what was true of completed marriages must also be true of intended marriage. Paul indeed considers the unwedded superior in itself to the wedded state; but things being as they were at Corinth, he prefers wedlock to celibacy. Without this, it would have been impossible to lay down this rule, for widows, "they are free to marry;" for the separated, "they may be reconciled;" for virgins, "they may marry." As to other excitable souls who think they can no longer endure wedlock with a Gentile husband, he touches them by their maternal feelings. If they feel certain that their children are sanctified by their faith, it is as certain that their husbands are. "Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy."[1] Certainly the Apostle feels that he is making a concession to the times when he admits such a severance of thought between the present and the future. Nor does he conceal it, when to these concessions he adds, not without resignation: "This I say by way of permission, not of commandment. Yet I would that all men were even as I myself. Howbeit each man hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that."[2]

With regard to meat offered to idols, Paul takes up a different attitude from that which he adopts towards the question of marriage. To marry, he regards as a concession to man's sensual nature; to abstain from meats offered to idols, is a concession to the feeble insight of Christians who inclined towards the Essenes. In itself, he sees no reason why such flesh should not be eaten. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." But he makes this concession in that breadth and depth of feeling which bids him make any sacrifice if it will but win souls to the kingdom of God. His followers in Corinth may take example by himself if they find it intolerable to let their freedom

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 14. [2] 1 Cor. vii. 6.

be overridden by the prejudices of the Jews. "Though I was free from all men, I brought myself under bondage to all, that I might gain the more. And to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law; to them that are without law, as without law. To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak: I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some. And I do all things for the gospel's sake, that I may be a joint-partaker thereof."[1] Thus he had moulded himself to every form, and shaped his conduct after all customs and usages. In the Jewish house he kept the law, to avoid giving offence; and in the Greek house he broke it, for the same reason. They too, then, might keep the law.[2] But there is a kind of piety which is not satisfied with consideration, but feels insulted and oppressed as long as any one lives after other principles than its own. These were the men who in Corinth now reproached the Apostle with everywhere permitting the enjoyment of meat offered to idols; nay, perhaps with partaking of it himself. The Apostle therefore finds himself in a position to defend his own mode of life against the unmeasured charges of these alien new-comers, "to answer those who judge him." "If I by grace partake, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?"[3] Thus rudely challenged, Paul is certainly provoked to remind these strangers, who let themselves be supported by the church[4] and appeal to the name of Peter, that he has offered other sacrifices than that of avoiding cheap meat and following the Jewish regulations as to food. Had not he as much right as they to eat and drink at the cost of the church? Had not he, like their model Peter, the right "to lead about a wife that is a believer"? Yet he had not done so, in order to avoid giving offence. The same course may be adopted in the present case by his followers. They should desist from eating sacrificial meat when they think it would give offence. "If meat," says Paul, "maketh my

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 19—23.
[2] 1 Cor. ix. 20.
[3] 1 Cor. x. 30, ix. 3.
[4] 1 Cor. ix. 1—12.

brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I make not my brother to stumble."[1]

One limitation, however. The Apostle knows there are some shamelessly weak brethren who, not satisfied with the avoidance in their presence of what they dislike, are troubled about what others think permissible on their principles. Paul bids each, therefore, buy what meat he pleases at the shambles; and if he is invited by a Gentile, to eat whatever is set before him. Christians, then, should not do like the Pharisees, who ask about every piece of flesh, whence it comes and how it is prepared, and about every vegetable, whether it had been tithed, and who had cooked it. Supposing that at such a meal the weaker brother caught the stronger by the arm and whispered, "That is meat sacrificed to idols," he should cease eating it, the Apostle adds, for his sake who pointed it out, and for conscience' sake. "Conscience, I say, not thine own, but the other's; for why is my liberty judged by another conscience?"[2] To abstain, therefore, is an act of consideration, not a duty. The weak, as he calls them, who feel constrained the moment they cannot constrain others, should know that they have no right to inquire whether such flesh of victims is not eaten anywhere; they should be thankful instead if it is not done in their presence for their weakness' sake. If the zealots, nevertheless, call it the doctrine of Balaam, or the Nicolaitans to set up a stumbling-block and teach the servants of God to eat flesh offered to idols, Paul was not the man to shrink before terrible names and empty phantoms.

So, too, he makes absolutely no concession in the sphere of worship. He takes up the position that no individual church has any new usages to introduce, not even the church of Corinth. The word of God did not proceed from it, and does not belong to it alone, while the customs it introduces are nowhere to be found in God's churches.[3] In particular, the behaviour of the Corinthian women excited the Apostle's disapproval beyond all else.

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 13. [2] 1 Cor. x. 29. [3] 1 Cor. xiv. 36.

Seeing a breach of feminine honour in this public and unveiled appearance of the women in Corinth, he issues the stern order to cut short the hair of such women in order to complete their likeness to courtesans.[1] Accustomed as he was to the Oriental position of women, he found such freedom of conduct doubly offensive. The veiling of women appeared to him not merely a laudable custom, but a natural instinct, which also taught women to wear long hair.[2] If the women of Corinth break this eternal law, as it seems to him, what happened before the days of the flood may well recur, when the sons of God, the angels, who attend invisible the worship of the churches, let themselves be seduced by the beauty of the daughters of men,[3]—a warning often employed by the Rabbis in justifying the veiling of women.[4]

So far as a desire for emancipation from their status lay at the bottom of this movement among the women, the Apostle seized the occasion to point out to them that the man is the head of the woman and the image of God. Moreover, the one party to a marriage must not desire to lead a religious life apart from the other. True marriage rather involves community of prayer; and true prayer implies unity of hearts. "Neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman, in the Lord."[5] Therefore the Apostle is no friend to those religious friendships of souls which separate husband and wife in their inmost and holiest thoughts. "If women would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home,"[6] says the Apostle. Perhaps there existed special reasons for this admonition. Very soon, at all events, still clearer hints in this direction were necessary.[7]

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 5, 6. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 15.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 10; Targum Jonathan on Gen. vi. 2; Enoch vi.; Dillman, p. 3.

[4] Ps. cxxxviii. 1; Buxtorf, Synagoga, x. (p. 222), xv. (p. 306), Basel, 1661; Targum Jonathan on Gen. vi. 2.

[5] 1 Cor. xi. 11. [6] 1 Cor. xiv. 34. [7] 2 Tim. iii. 6.

More elementary still were the demands of propriety requisite to restore order in the *agapes*. The descriptions of these common meals are most realistic and lifelike. We see the rich open their packages; they each consume their own cake, and answer to those who rebuke them, "We could not wait." "What!" then cries the Apostle; "have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and put them to shame that have not?" It is a very moderate test of love Paul asks for: "My brethren, when ye come together to eat, wait one for another. If any man is hungry, let him eat at home; that your coming together be not unto judgment. And the rest will I set in order whensoever I come."[1]

What Paul takes most seriously, however, is the profanation of the holy mystery of the Eucharist. He reminds the church of the many cases of illness there have been amongst them since they took the bread and wine of the Supper without distinguishing the body. "For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep."[2] How many have eaten and drunken judgment unto themselves, have become weak and sickly, have fallen away and died! Such a warning could hardly fail to bring to their senses those who drunkenly stretched forth their hands to the blessed cup, or desired the bread to satisfy their bodily hunger, without an inward desire for him whom the bread represents. With the same unfailing mastery, the Apostle finally achieved the delicate task of disciplining the self-styled outpourings of the Holy Spirit in the congregations. After using a free imitation of Menenius Agrippa's well-known fable to delicately satirize the jealous rivalry of various members which was the secret cause of all the disorder,[3] he gives so humorous a sketch of the mischief, that those who before were distressed never to have felt a vestige of the impulse towards ecstatic utterance, now without doubt laughed in secret to hear the conduct of their lately overbearing prophets so bitterly

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 22, 33, 34. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 30.

[3] Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 12 with Liv. ii. 32.

satirized.[1] For the Apostle, instead of standing in blank amazement before this new outpouring of the Holy Spirit, instead of folding his hands and making an edifying speech, cries to the church: "Brethren, be not children in understanding. . . . . If I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you? If the whole church be assembled together, and all speak with tongues, and there come in men unlearned or unbelieving, will they not say that ye are mad?"[2]

The Apostle dashes their enthusiasm with his chilling irony in order to help their return to sound sense. He further gives positive ordinances which would automatically bring about the gradual disuse of ecstasy. Not more than two, or at most three, persons should speak with tongues in one assemblage, and then only if there is one at hand to interpret his broken words. "But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself and to God. . . . . For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified."

There are equally categorical ordinances for the prophets, who disturbed the peace of the church with speaking all together and quarrelling for the right of addressing the assembly. The Apostle could either give certain speakers the right for each meeting, or permit each individual a certain period for speech. Not to damp the enthusiasm of the meetings, he chose a middle course. Two or three speakers should speak of an evening; but if a revelation should come to one who sits by, the first should be silent and the other rise up. But if any one declares that the Holy Spirit will not be thus bound by rule, he replies: "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets; for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace."

But Paul scarcely enters upon the actual question in dispute among the prophets. For this purpose he has sent Timothy to Corinth, to explain even as Paul teaches in all churches. It is only in the dispute over the body of the resurrection that he thinks it needful to set forth his point of view, for he refuses

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 15, 20. [2] 1 Cor. xiv. 14—23.

to be made responsible on any condition whatever for the spiritualistic doctrines brought into the church by the school of Apollos. It is perfectly clear, too, that the Apostle is resolved to avoid even the appearance of admitting this free-thinking to be the fruit of his own gospel.[1] The direct relation of the whole labour of his life to the approaching new order of things nowhere appears more clearly than here, when he declares: "If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most pitiable. . . . . If I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me? If the dead are not raised, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."[2]

It is striking to see, also, how the certainty of the change to a new spiritual body is connected with the oppression that lies upon him as he drags along with this weak and sickly body. "We know," he says, returning to the same question in a later passage, "that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens. For verily in this we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven. . . . . For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened."[3]

It is the oppression of the finite that here again proves to him the necessity of the infinite. Now in support of this direct fact of his consciousness he adduces various reasons; the bare soul does not exist without a body; according to universal laws of development, the coarser body is always succeeded by the finer; as our present body is formed after the first Adam, so there must be a second body formed after the heavenly Adam. If any would doubt the possibility of any such new and different body, Paul points out to him how even in this æon every creature has its own flesh, and each body its own glory. He bids his readers lift up their eyes with him to the Ionian sky at night, even as thousands have looked up in admiration, and see how each star shines in its own glory. He points upwards to the moon's shining disc, whose gentle light is praised by so many

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 33. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 19, 32. [3] 2 Cor. v. 1—4.

songs and legends of Asia Minor in contrast to the glaring sun. Thus every body has its own glory, and thus shall the righteous shine in their Father's kingdom.

Nor does the Apostle fail to point out the inconsistency of preaching the resurrection of Christ and denying the resurrection of man. It was easy for the school of Apollos to predicate a great deal about the Word become flesh which did not hold for the rest of mankind, but Paul refused to be responsible for such speculations. The doctrine of the resurrection was likewise the first thing he had preached in his time.[1] On this point he insists upon his being at one with the Christians of Palestine. "Whether, then, it be I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed."[2]

---

6. The Struggle over the Apostolate.

Works whose effect lasts for centuries not unfrequently fail of their immediate object. Among the many narratives of the contemptuous manner in which the immortal creations of the masters were received by their ungrateful correspondents, the history of the First Epistle to the Corinthians may count as an exception. The church had desired counsel from Paul, not reproof and rebuke. Considering the great opinion of themselves held by the Corinthians, courted as they were by all manner of teachers and partizans, they were deeply concerned to find the Apostle's new letter still more severe and stern than the one they had already replied to. Thereupon, as often happens in such gatherings, they accepted the censure, but raised a virulent resistance to the practical demands.

Of these demands, Paul had made two which have not yet been mentioned. One was for disciplinary correction of an unworthy member of the church; the other bade them take part in the collection for Jerusalem begun in Asia Minor. On

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 3. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 11.

these two points there now arose a hot quarrel, conducted on the part of the Corinthians with the utmost virulence.

The moral condition of many members of the church has been referred to more than once. The habit of unchastity was too deeply rooted in the city of Aphrodite to be extirpated by the mere preaching of the Apostle. Far from this, the Corinthians applied Paul's gospel, that the kingdom of God does not consist in fasting and outward ceremonial, to sexual relations, and held that every indulgence of natural instinct was, on the Christian view, as indifferent as eating and drinking. It was, indeed, connected with a reaction against Essene exaggeration, which explained the natural instincts as sinful in themselves, while Paul made a rigid distinction between everything belonging to the flesh and the life in the spirit derived from another world. The more closely this disorder attached itself to his dualistic principles, the greater his indignation at this misapplication of his maxim, "All things are lawful for me." He opposes it with the emphatic declaration: "All things are lawful for me; but not all things are expedient. Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord. What, know ye not that your body is the temple of God?"[1]

With such principles in vogue, Paul could not stop at reproofs. On his former visit he had threatened to show no mercy if he did not find an alteration in Corinth when he came again.[2] What he meant, then, in our Epistle by saying he would come with the rod and the spirit of wrath,[3] is to be seen from the manner in which he fulfilled his threat. He had in view a miraculous act of chastisement. But now there took place a transgression so revolting that the Apostle could no longer hesitate to carry out his threat. A Corinthian Christian was living incestuously with his own stepmother, and that too while his father still lived and offered vigorous resistance;[4] yet

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 12—20.
[2] 2 Cor. xiii. 3.
[3] 1 Cor. iv. 21.
[4] 2 Cor. vii. 12.

the church did not choose to put an end to this scandal.[1] Now the lewdness of the Corinthians had always been a stumbling-block to other Christians, but this case was a scandal even to the Gentiles, and might well lead to the most sweeping judgments on the new sect. For the Apostle was perfectly right in saying that such matters were an abomination even to the Gentiles. From the Acrocorinthus could still be seen the lofty rock where Hippolytus flung himself down on his way from Troezen, because the mere accusation of this crime robbed him of reason; while the queen, who had sinned in thought alone, hanged herself at Athens when she saw her love betrayed to her stepson.[2] This being the case, Paul ventured upon the phrase which was so offensive to the Corinthians: "It is actually reported that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not even among the Gentiles."[3]

Who the new Phædra was who had caught this Christian in her toils, we do not know; only she could not have belonged to the church, for Paul does not extend his punishment to her. On the other hand, the sinner and the outraged husband were members of the church.[4] One may indeed feel provoked to ask why so grievous a sinner is to be found in these meetings at all; why he exposes himself to the chastisement of the words of the prophets and the promises of the Sermon on the Mount, which calls blessed the pure in heart. Why should he, conscious of his sin, listen evening after evening to the terrors of the approaching judgment? But this is not a solitary example of a nature thus sunk in grossness and sensuality, possessing a strongly religious sense of dependence, despite all incapacity to raise itself from the slough in which it is sunk, and expecting to gain help from the church against its moral weakness, its pangs of conscience, and feebleness of moral fibre. Such must have been the state of moral enervation into which the sinner

[1] 1 Cor. v. 1—13.

[2] Diod. Bibl. iv. 62. Cf. a parallel case in Philostr. Apollon. vi. 3.

[3] 1 Cor. v. 1.

[4] 2 Cor. vii. 12.

in question had fallen: for when Paul utters his dark sentence, the condemned, instead of resisting stubbornly, dissolves into tears, and is plunged in the waters of affliction.[1] He sinned, therefore, from weakness rather than evil, as is further shown by the fact that the church had suffered him to remain in it, and indeed took his part against Paul.[2] The case of the injured father, too, must have been peculiar, for the church accused Paul of partiality; and he himself not only admits that their communications justify them, but positively repudiates having had the slightest partiality for either side.[3]

But there are transgressions for which no Jew admits extenuating circumstances. Such was the one in point; and Paul had to pass sentence. If he had referred the case to the courts of law, Gallio's officials would have condemned the son to death or transportation, and the woman to banishment in any place she chose.[4] But the Apostle was reluctant to let any member of the church go to law before the Gentiles.[5] If, on the other hand, he consulted the Jewish law, the most natural thing for a former lawyer, this law in three several places demanded the expulsion of the incestuous from the congregation.[6] In obedience to this law, and in its very words, Paul decreed the same penalty: "Put away the wicked man from among yourselves."[7] He pronounces this judgment with the consciousness that God, who has set life and death in his hand, will fulfil his doom without human aid. "I verily," so runs his obscure utterance, "being absent in body but present in spirit, have already, as though I were present, judged him that hath so wrought this thing,

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 7.

[2] 2 Cor. ii. 3—11.

[3] 2 Cor. vii. 11, 12.

[4] Tac. Ann. xii. 8, vi. 19.

[5] Paul seems to have considered the possibility of a civil punishment, for he forbids complaints to be laid before the prætor immediately after discussing this point. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 1.

[6] Levit. xviii. 8, xx. 11; Deut. xxvii. 20.

[7] Deut. xvii. 7; 1 Cor. v. 13, and i. 2. The Hebrew phrase, "his father's wife," instead of *μητρυιά*, further shows that Paul had the Jewish law in his mind. Cf. Levit. xviii. 8.

in the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."[1]

What Paul, then, would do by virtue of his apostolic power and miraculous gift, if he were now in Corinth, he deputes to the assembly of the church; and he will be present in the spirit with the peculiar power of Jesus, with which he knows he is equipped. This power will cause him who is excommunicated to fall under the power of Satan, who will plague his flesh with sickness and pain until he perish, that his spirit may repent and be saved against the day of the kingdom.[2] A time was also fixed within which the church was to carry out his ordinance. The feast of the Passover was at hand. Till then the leaven should be put away, that the church should keep the feast with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.[3] The Apostle himself confesses that he did not find it easy to write thus. As he explains later, he counted on the conversion of the sinner;[4] he was trying the church, and wished to test their obedience and care for him.[5] He wrote in great distress and sorrow, dissolved in tears, that there might be no tears when he came in person and all would be intensified by his personal presence.[6] Nevertheless, this warning was a remarkable step; and condemnation like this must have fallen with crushing force upon the sinner, who had maintained his faith in the church despite all the cold looks he most certainly met with. It was terrible for a man, perhaps all unprepared, to hear such a condemnation with his own ears; but doubly terrifying at a time when, apart from this, we are told, an unusual amount of sickness and death thinned the ranks of the church.[7]

Indeed, this announcement so utterly crushed the sinner at once, that some feared he would be worn out by his sorrow.[8]

[1] 1 Cor. v. 3—6. [2] So 1 Cor. xi. 30—32.
[3] 1 Cor. v. 6—8. [4] 2 Cor. ii. 2. [5] 2 Cor. ii. 8, vii. 12.
[6] 2 Cor. ii. 3. [7] 1 Cor. xi. 30. [8] 2 Cor. ii. 7.

Now since some found the punishment too severe, and others tried to force this test of his miraculous powers on the Apostle—while some, again, imagined he took the father's part, perhaps because the latter belonged to the Pauline party—a bitter quarrel broke out over the execution of the Apostle's demand, and the sinner meanwhile remained long unpunished. It was not till later that the majority imposed a milder penalty on him, which still seemed to be severe enough.[1] It is doubtful whether this majority was opposed by a minority, which demanded that the transgressor should actually be given over to Satan. What is clear is, that from the very beginning a strong party in the church resisted the demands of the Apostle, and brought him to trial instead of the man who was guilty of incest. Was not this, they said, the old Saul who had cried out so passionately against Stephen, "Put away the evil-doer from amongst you"?—who had stood by when the saint was buried beneath a shower of stones? Did he not continue to "walk in the flesh and war with carnal weapons"?[2] On the other hand, how convenient to shift the burden of the miracle upon others, instead of coming to carry out the punishment in person.[3] Were not all his threats, indeed, empty terrors? Did he really possess this power, or did he merely boast of it because he was far away?[4] Would that he would really come and prove his miraculous power,[5] instead of terrifying people by letter![6]

Such were the voices boldly raised against the Apostle in the house of Titius Justus after the reading of the letter. Their fainter echoes, it may be, still meet us with much of their own virulence in the last four chapters of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Instead, then, of proceeding against the sinner, it was resolved to wait for Paul's arrival, that he might prove in person the Christ who spoke through him.[7] The whole struggle narrowed to a struggle over the Apostleship of Paul.

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 7. [2] 2 Cor. x. 2, 3. [3] 2 Cor. x. 10.
[4] 2 Cor. x. 8, 9. [5] 2 Cor. xiii. 3—10. [6] 2 Cor. x. 9.
[7] 2 Cor. xii. 3.

Now it is quite conceivable that an opposition like this was not content with rejecting a demand afterwards recognized by the Apostle as excessive, but immediately proceeded to cast suspicion on their troublesome teacher himself. The best opportunity for this was given by Paul's second demand upon the church, that they should take part in the collection for the poor of Jerusalem, which he was at that time organizing in Asia Minor, especially in Galatia.[1] The Corinthians, indeed, had themselves made inquiry as to the state of this question, and at the same time undoubtedly offered their assistance in this universal work of love in pompous Greek fashion. To this end Paul had bidden them to lay by the savings of each week at the beginning of the next, each as he may prosper, in order that the collection should not merely begin when he reached Corinth. Even after the breach Paul was ready to take the gift to Jerusalem himself; or, if it were not large enough, the Corinthians should despatch it themselves. Such, too, were the arrangements in Galatia.[2]

As Paul was inclined to take the churches at their word for this good end, he bade Titus speak of it in Corinth.[3] Titus was chosen for this duty because he had himself been in Jerusalem, and had been convinced of the famine with his own eyes. He, too, had joined Paul and Barnabas, morally at least, in undertaking the cause of the poor in Jerusalem.[4] As a Greek, on the other hand, he seemed best adapted to get on with these incalculable Corinthians. Now when Titus did make mention of the collection in Corinth, the church transferred their ill-will against the letter to this undertaking. Paul had not asked them to contribute, professedly for the same reason why he had never asked them for help towards his own travels, because he knew their suspicious nature.[5] They had brought themselves to it with their usual habit of making lofty professions.[6]

Now that their ardour had cooled, they found themselves

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 1.
[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 1—4.
[3] 2 Cor. xii. 18, viii. 7.
[4] Gal. ii. 3.
[5] 2 Cor. xi. 12.
[6] 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2.

bound by their promise. Naturally, it was the wiles of Paul that had brought them to this pass. Go back, they could not; pay, they would not; so they felt they had been duped, and were ready to charge Paul with craft and duplicity. "Being crafty," says Paul, scornfully, "I caught you with guile."[1] This, too, explains why, in his next two letters, the Apostle appeals so directly to the testimony of his conscience, that he behaved himself in holiness and sincerity, and not in worldly wisdom;[2] that he has renounced the hidden things of shame and does not walk in craftiness,[3] and endeavours to be as open to men as his soul within is open to the eye of God.[4]

But his opponents did not remain in this position. Strange as it sounds, it is nevertheless true that the Apostle Paul was forced to defend himself before them on a charge of deliberate overreaching. "Did I take advantage of you by any one of them whom I have sent unto you?" he asks. "Did Titus take any advantage of you? walked we not by the same spirit? walked we not in the same steps?"[5] To find this conceivable, one must imagine oneself in the petty circumstances of the members of the church. Among these journeymen and slaves, who themselves not unfrequently lived by dishonesty, it was a matter of course that in dealings with money there should be pickings.[6] To them, the most outrageous suspicions were the first to be believed. It began to dawn on them at last why Paul took all this trouble about Corinth, and undertook these struggles with the synagogue, these many labours and sufferings. He wanted money. This was a motive they could understand. How cleverly he had set about it too. He had not begged a single sesterce when he was present, but afterwards demanded large sums through Titus. "Be it so," says Paul, with bitter irony, "when I was present, I did not myself burden you; but being crafty, I caught you with guile."[7]

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 16. [2] 2 Cor. i. 12. [3] 2 Cor. iv. 2.
[4] 2 Cor. v. 11. [5] 2 Cor. xii. 17, seq.
[6] 2 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 20, xii. 17, 18. [7] 2 Cor. xii. 16.

The matter once settled from this point of view, it was not difficult to collect instances of people whom Paul had taken advantage of; nay, even ruined.[1] Perhaps the Corinthians had prepared themselves for smaller sums than what they saw set down from the other churches; perhaps one or another of the willing donors had given too much in their earliest zeal, and, even though these better persons did not afterwards repent of their liberality, the rest were the more certain that Paul had ruined them. Nothing else can be meant by the Apostle's explanation: "We wronged no man, we corrupted no man, we took advantage of no man."[2] Such a complaint of course could not be seriously maintained; but all confidence in the character of the Apostle was utterly destroyed by these mistrustful and malicious persons, or else such charges would never have been ventured upon.

With this the harvest of the Judaists seemed ripe. If Paul was not the man to bring help, if Apollos let his insincere friends keep him from coming to Corinth, what was easier than to send to Jerusalem and see whether the apostles there would interest themselves in this distracted situation? If the freedom of Pauline Christianity had paved the way for the grossest libertinism, must not the necessity of the discipline of the law be clear to the dullest vision? This point of view had no lack of supporters. In his first Epistle, Paul had already made mention in passing of those who cast doubts on his Apostleship, because he had not seen the Lord Jesus Christ.[3] The fact that these strangers, and not Paul, had obtained maintenance from the church, served them as a proof that he himself was conscious of being no apostle. These deniers of his mission being foreigners, Paul thought little of it, for he assured himself, "if to others I am not an apostle, yet at least am I to you, for the seal of mine apostleship are ye."

But in this he had trusted his Corinthians too far, and was to learn that in Corinth, at all events, men were reckoned at their

[1] 2 Cor. vii. 2. [2] Ibid. [3] 1 Cor. ix. 1.

own valuation.[1] These "others," who, the Apostle manifestly takes it for granted, would proceed on their way after "exercising their right of eating the fruit of the vineyard they had planted, and milking the herds they had fed," instead of departing, remained, and not only extended their system of plunder so as to injure the development of the church, but took the lead as directors in chief.[2] They were the real origin of the new opposition in Corinth, so that it will be necessary to get a clearer view of the personality of these party leaders.

There is no doubt about their having come from abroad. They are people who "glory in another's province in regard of things ready to their hand:" who appropriate "other men's labours;" who stretch themselves overmuch, and reach beyond the limit which God apportioned to them.[3] From the account they gave of themselves, it follows that they were not in a position to found churches of their own, but gloried in another's province.[4] The Apostle finds it absurd, also, to see how they commend themselves, and measure themselves by each other, and draw comparisons, so that the church learns the glory of each by the mouth of another, and is filled with their praise and their deeds. They have "reached everywhere;" the only pity is that others have been before them everywhere, men who laboured at the work which they now boast of.[5] Their real business, therefore, is not to spread the gospel, but to live by it; "they deal deceitfully with the word;" they are the "hucksters of the gospel," as the Apostle calls them sarcastically.

But it is not the best goods that are thus taken around.[6] They leave no one in doubt as to their source. One of the title-deeds on which they rest their claims to domineer over the church is, that they are true "Hebrews,"[7] in whom the consecration of the people of God was not lost by birth in the Dispersion. They are Israelites, "whose is the adoption, and the glory, and

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 21. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 19, 20. [3] 2 Cor. x. 13—17.
[4] 2 Cor. x. 15. [5] Ibid. [6] 2 Cor. ii. 17.
[7] 2 Cor. xi. 22.

the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers."[1] Finally, they are the "seed of Abraham," to whom alone Messianic salvation is secured.[2] They therefore assumed the same position towards the Christian and Greek church at Corinth as the synagogue did towards Gentile believers. As Israelites, they are the born mediators of the coming kingdom; as such, they lent help to the Greeks, who without them would be lost; but they demanded the same reverence as they received from the women among the proselytes of the gate, who were ready to kiss the hem of the Rabbi's garment. This is the "bringing into bondage, the taking captive, the smiting on the face," of which Paul speaks here just as in the Epistle to the Galatians.[3] But the multitude is enslaved willingly, under an inward necessity to bear the clog and give up their own, when by so doing they think to cast off the burden of sin. "Ye bear with the foolish gladly," says Paul in astonishment, "being wise yourselves. For ye bear with a man, if he bringeth you into bondage, if he devoureth you, if he taketh you captive, if he exalteth himself, if he smiteth you on the face. I speak by way of disparagement, as though we had been weak."[4]

Yet this Hebrew descent is not the only reason why their followers look up to them. They have one special superiority which the Apostle often alludes to, yet never likes to name directly. They boast of an "appearance,"[5] which Paul, they declare, lacks. We should not know in what this "appearance" consisted, were it not that Paul says incidentally: "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more."[6] This, then, is the one and only superiority which raises them so high over the Apostle. They have seen Christ, and Paul has not. He of course adopts a point of view from which even this highest qualification ceases to be significant. With Golgotha, he says, the old things are passed away, and with it all personal

[1] Rom. ix. 4. [2] Rom. ix. 7—xi. 1; Gal. iii. 6—14, iv. 21—30.
[3] 2 Cor. xi. 20; Gal. ii. 4. [4] 2 Cor. xi. 19.
[5] 2 Cor. v. 12, x. 7, xi. 18; Gal. ii. 6. [6] 2 Cor. v. 16.

advantages, so that now every one lives only in him who rose again. Consequently we henceforth know no man after the flesh; and though some have an advantage over us in having seen Christ after the flesh, that exists no more, for in Christ we have become a new creature. "The old things are passed away; behold, they are become new."[1]

Thus he sees no difference between himself and the others. "Ye look at the things that are before your face," he says reproachfully to the church. "If any man trusteth in himself that he is Christ's, let him consider this again with himself, that, even as he is Christ's, so also are we."[2] "We all are Christ's, and Christ is God's," he had said already in the first Epistle.[3] There, too, he had set his vision of the glorified Lord against their knowledge of the living Redeemer. "Am I not an apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?"[4] On that occasion, as on this, he referred to his vision and its result.[5] This was enough for himself; but in practice the ordinary consciousness drew a great distinction between one who was an eye-witness of the immortal days of Capernaum, Cæsarea, Philippi and Bethany, who could from his own experience describe how Jesus preached from the boat beside the shore of the lake, and healed the demoniacs and fulminated against the Pharisees, how he entered Jerusalem and bowed his head upon Golgotha, and one who, like Paul, preached a "hidden gospel,"[6] the obscure preaching of justification by faith.

It is only too easy to understand that the multitude turned to these eye-witnesses of Jesus' life. We ourselves, indeed, are inclined to imagine a peculiar halo round the head of every one belonging to the blessed circle who received the living word of Jesus. But not all believed who heard, nor did all who believed grow better. Those who now lived in Corinth were also among

[1] 2 Cor. v. 15—17.
[2] 2 Cor. x. 7.
[3] 1 Cor. iii. 23.
[4] 1 Cor. ix. 1; also xv. 8.
[5] 1 Cor. ix. 1—3, xv. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 23—xii. 10.
[6] 2 Cor. iv. 3.

these blessed hearers. They, too, had found that the best period in their lives; but now they had made a business of what once was true enthusiasm. They "huckster the gospel," says the Apostle. All the faults inexorably held up to them by Paul touch them nearly. Not only did they proudly call themselves "those of Christ," and monopolize the name of Jesus, but they passed easily from what they bore witness to in every quarter of the world, to what they themselves had done; and so they preached "themselves" instead of Christ.[1] The vast missionary journeys they undertook became the subject of their preaching;[2] they boast, indeed, of things which now no one perceives in them,[3] and of other things which, as is their nature, get beyond all control.[4] But the point of view of the majority of the church being what it was, the accounts of these missions of the circumcision soon found even greater sympathy than did the alluring rhetoric of the brother Apollos but a little while before.

Their arrogance and presumption were tolerated; nay more, they were permitted to assume the direction of the church. How could any one who had not seen Jesus, teach the true gospel? How does Paul come to call himself an Apostle, when the band of Apostles in Jerusalem filled up the gap left by the defection of Judas with one of those who had been with Jesus the whole time from John the Baptist till the last days of his glorious ascension?[5] What sort of an Apostle, too, was this man, frail, wanting in personal presence,[6] visited by strange diseases,[7] sometimes beside himself, even insane;[8] and for this reason full of passion, and wanting in divine peace and patience and steadfastness, the tokens of a true Apostle?[9]

To a temper so hostile, this case of incest was a welcome opportunity to destroy the Apostle's reputation. This, without doubt, was the quarter from which emanated the hints that

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 18. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 15, seq.; similarly, xi. 23—xii. 1.
[3] 2 Cor. xi. 12. [4] 2 Cor. xii. 6; similarly, xii. 1—5.
[5] Acts i. 21, 22. [6] 2 Cor. iv. 7. [7] 2 Cor. iv. 10, xii. 7—10.
[8] 2 Cor. v. 13. [9] 2 Cor. xii. 12.

Paul was unable to exercise the power which, he boasted, he would display against the guilty man.[1] On the one hand, therefore, they required Paul first to prove himself; to offer proof of the spirit and power, and "work amongst them the signs of an apostle." On the other hand, they procured a resolution of the church, inviting to Corinth one of the chief apostolic authorities, who had the true preaching and the true spirit.[2] We do not know whether they addressed themselves to one of the twelve apostles, or the brothers of Jesus, or some other eminent authority; but it was clearly some final arbiter, whose knowledge of the gospel and possession of the spirit could not be disputed even by Paul, and whose arrival he could not see without concern, for, as things stood, this invitation was only one more move in the enemy's game.

The reason of punishment being so long delayed in the case of incest was, perhaps, that the one party still counted on Paul's coming, while the Judaists looked for the genuine Apostle "who cometh."[3] But as Ephesus was nearer than Jerusalem, Paul naturally heard of the state of affairs before the arrival of the expected envoy, and the last four chapters of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians are Paul's answer to this disgraceful intrigue.[4]

---

7. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

Our second canonical Epistle to the Corinthians is composed of two separate letters, differing greatly in tone and manner. The shorter, chaps. x.—xiii., belongs to an earlier series of events, and envisages the situation described above. It may be inferred from the beginning of this letter, chap. x. 1, that it was preceded by a circular letter from the brethren at Ephesus, in which they

[1] 2 Cor. x. 7—10. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 4, 5. [3] 2 Cor. xi. 4.

[4] For the relation of 2 Cor. x. 1—xiii. 3, to chaps. i.—ix., see my essay, Der Vier-Capitel Brief des P. a. d. Cor.: Heidelb. b. Bassermann, 1870.

also expressed themselves upon a question of such importance for the whole of Christendom.[1]

The congregation in the house of Aquila must have been stimulated to say their say upon Corinthian affairs by none other than Aquila. However this may be, it is clear from the form of the introduction that Paul wrote his explanation as a pendant to an extraneous letter: "Now I, Paul myself, entreat you," where Paul speaks of himself in contradistinction to other persons who have spoken already.[2] The grave charges impudently made against Paul by his adversaries are ample justification for the tone, at once bitter and haughty, with which he encounters the church. The Corinthians cradle themselves in the delusion that he dares not appear in Corinth because, being "of no account in speech," and "humble and weak," he lacks confidence to confront his antagonists in open combat. He begins, therefore, in language which for lofty pride equals the introduction to the Epistle to the Galatians: "I, Paul, who in your presence am lowly among you, but being absent am of good courage toward you; yea, I beseech you, that I may not when present show courage with the confidence wherewith I count to be bold against some, which count of us as if we walked according to the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds; casting down imaginations and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ; and

[1] Hence also in 2 Cor. iii. 1, his sarcastic allusions to letters of commendation and self-commendation, as well as the acknowledgment, i. 14.

[2] The copyist, whose copy was reproduced, has (as can easily be explained) incorporated only this supplement into his collection of Pauline Epistles, omitting the letter from the Ephesian church, or whatever it was went before, for the simple reason that he was collecting Pauline Epistles, and not favourite writings of the primitive Church. The best place, then, for this epistle without a salutation was at the end of the second canonical epistle. A similar addition is recognizable in 2 Cor. vi. 14—vii. 1, which, perhaps, stood originally after 1 Cor. x. 22. Cf. Ewald, Sendschreiben des Paulus, pp. 231, 281, seq., ad loc.

being in readiness to avenge all disobedience." Accused of boasting a power of destruction[1] which he has not, and called upon to offer a proof of the Christ that speaketh in him,[2] he answers haughtily: "Though I should glory somewhat abundantly concerning our authority (which the Lord gave for building you up, and not for casting you down), I shall not be put to shame, that I may not seem as if I would terrify you by my letters. . . . . I trust then that you will find I do not boast emptily."

So turning at once to his former activity amongst them, he can confidently reply: "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, by signs and wonders and mighty works. For what is there wherein ye were made inferior to the rest of the churches, except it be that I myself was not a burden to you? Forgive me this wrong."[3] He does not, then, in the least shrink from the miraculous test demanded of him. If the guilty man is condemned—for the Corinthians seem still to deny that he is as guilty as Paul thinks[4]—Paul will know no more mercy, as they demand proof of the Christ that speaks in him. This Christ may for a while be dead in Paul, but after death assuredly comes the resurrection.[5] He hopes, then, the Corinthians shall learn that he is not incapable of meeting the test. If, indeed, they are guiltless, then the miraculous power will fail. "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth:" wherefore he begs them to be converted before he is compelled to try the test. For he will not be justified at their expense; indeed, he will be glad if he proves weak in this affair, and they strong. "For this cause," he concludes, "I write these things while absent, that I may not when present deal sharply, according to the authority which the Lord gave me for building up, and not for casting down."[6]

On the whole, these utterances give the impression that Paul

[1] 2 Cor. x. 8, xiii. 10.
[2] 2 Cor. xiii. 2, seq.
[3] 2 Cor. xii. 11—14.
[4] 2 Cor. xiii. 1.
[5] 2 Cor. xiii. 4.
[6] 2 Cor. xiii. 1—10.

calmly contemplated the possibility of being forced to work an avenging miracle, yet thinking all the time it might turn against himself if the truth were not on his side. At any rate, the church has no right to claim it as a proof of his apostleship: "Try your own selves, prove your own selves," he cries to cavilling doubters. With regard to the authorities ranged against him, he draws a distinction between the "very chiefest apostles" in Jerusalem and the "lying apostles" in Corinth. The latter he designates simply as "false apostles," "deceitful workers," "ministers of Satan who fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness," as in rabbinical legend the devil often assumes the form of an angel of light. Would that they would learn the reality of unselfishness which they dispute in him, instead of enslaving the church, and consuming it, and cajoling it out of its property, and in return puffing themselves up, and smiting their benefactors on the face.[1] Though they may always have belonged to Christ—though, in mutual admiration, they relate all that is great and good of one another—still he too belongs to Christ, and may boast that he has not invaded the province of another, like those who act as though it were they, and not Paul, Silas and Timothy, who brought Christianity to Achaia.[2] It is otherwise with the apostles in Jerusalem, and "he that cometh."[3] If he that cometh preaches another Jesus, or brings a different spirit or a different gospel, the Corinthians will do well to accept it, for Paul is far from denying that they have the true gospel and the true spirit. But it will not be different. "For," he adds proudly, "I reckon that I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. But though I be rude in speech, yet am I not in knowledge; nay, in everything we have made it manifest among all men to you-ward."[4] So far, then, he could look with equanimity upon the plot his enemies had hatched against him; but he fears that this new apotheosis of men will only tend to estrange the church in Corinth from Christ, and so

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 13—20.
[2] 2 Cor. x. 12—18, i. 19.
[3] 2 Cor. xi. 4.
[4] 2 Cor. xi. 4—6.

the bride of Christ, forgetting her bridegroom, will turn her eyes to men. But this his zeal, that espoused the church, cannot endure. "I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ. But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ."[1]

Now whether the adversaries chant the praises of themselves or of the chiefest apostles, he need fear neither the one nor the other. It is simple folly to boast oneself, as they do; but if the Corinthians compel him, he too will boast, yet not of his deeds, but of his weaknesses. "Wherefore I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong." Then is unfolded that terrible record of his stripes, his captivities, his perils of death, his scourgings and stonings, his shipwrecks and journeyings, his perils by river and sea, by city and wilderness, perils from robbers, from Jews and Gentiles, and, grievous to tell, perils even among false brethren. He lets them glance at his harassed and persecuted life, passed amid labour and toil and vigils, in hunger and thirst, sometimes even in nakedness and cold.[2] Yet in all his own grief and suffering "there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches. Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is made to stumble, and I burn not?" Assuredly this pre-eminence in a life of suffering will not be turned to his discredit by any of those who travel from place to place with their wives, and accept maintenance and something more from the churches. "No man shall stop me of this glorying in the regions of Achaia."

But they will say, This is all very well, but it is not to the point. Where the others have a constant advantage over you is, that they have seen Jesus, and still have intercourse with him

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 2, 3.

[2] 2 Cor. xi. 22—30. The same situation as 1 Cor. iv. 11—14, therefore before Easter.

in "visions and revelations."[1] Thus harassed and hunted and brought to bay, he lets them catch a glimpse of the mystery of his most holy hour, when, fourteen years before, during his labours in Syria, he was caught up into the heaven of the rolling clouds, and thence again into Paradise, where he heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. His soul struggles and labours to speak of this; and scarcely has he done so, when he cries indignantly: "I am become foolish: ye compelled me."

Yet he will not use this as a means to drive others out of the field. None shall judge more highly of him than by what he can see with his own eyes and hear with his own ears—a palpable hit at those who base their authority on visions and revelations, to which no third witness can testify.[2] Finally, he passes more lightly over the charge of self-seeking, for the church cannot really be in earnest with it. The Corinthians know full well that in the times of direct necessity he accepted nothing from them, preferring to be supported by the churches of Macedonia, because he knew there were people about him seeking for a handle against him. Yet they might name the messenger by whom he had overreached them. The rest concerns Titus, whom he besought to undertake the affair, and who was anything but his emissary. It is he they must settle with; but Paul knows beforehand that he walks by the same spirit and in the same steps.

Paul had never before sunk so low as to be forced to defend his personal honour. He puts aside the idea that compulsion was the reason for doing so now. "Think ye all this time that we are excusing ourselves unto you? In the sight of God speak we in Christ. But all things, beloved, are for your edification." It is they rather who will have to excuse themselves when he comes; for if he finds things as on his last visit, he will not spare, even as he threatened before.

We do not know by whom this Epistle was despatched to

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 1. [2] 2 Cor. xii. 6.

Corinth; but in any case the church failed of its intention to induce Paul to set out at once for Corinth. Paul, it is true, declares himself ready to come immediately to Corinth, the third time, as he says emphatically twice over; but he sends the letter before him to give the church time to recover itself. "For this cause," he concludes, "I write these things while absent, that I may not when present deal sharply, according to the authority which the Lord gave me for building up, and not for casting down." The meaning of this he afterwards explains in detail.[1] He wished to see whether his letter would produce the desired effect upon the temper of the Corinthians, and not to visit them till then, intending, of course, to go direct from Ephesus, not, as he actually did, by way of Macedonia. His immediate idea, then, which the Corinthians too prepared for, was to settle the burning questions at Corinth as soon as possible, then to proceed to Macedonia, and finally, as he could count on easier communication between Cenchreæ and Cæsarea, to return to Corinth before setting out for Jerusalem.

Now it is of course very noticeable that once more Paul did not fulfil his promise, but returned instead to his first and much simpler plan[2] of journeying to Corinth by way of Macedon, and then taking ship to Syria. No doubt Paul did not promise an immediate visit in so many words, but, on the contrary, indicated the other possibility as well. But even to write in this way annoyed the Corinthians. They said "he wrote other things than what they read, or even acknowledged."[3] Even his own followers mistook his meaning; they were forced to admit that he made promises lightly, that he purposed according to the flesh, and that with him the Yea, yea, and the Nay, nay, were to be taken as each man thinks fit.[4] While people in Corinth were still expecting the great and heaven-sent miracle of punishment "as a proof," Paul had taken his way northward. As for

[1] 2 Cor. i. 12, seq.
[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 6—9.
[3] 2 Cor. i. 13.
[4] 2 Cor. i. 17.

the proof, the situation rested with his counsel: "Try your own selves; prove your own selves."

As might be expected, Corinth was universally dissatisfied with so tame an ending to this strained situation. Paul's adversaries now thought their charge of faint-heartedness proved;[1] his very followers were no little cast down. Yet, though he did not disclose it, Paul had the best of reasons for acting thus, and not otherwise. Apart from his disinclination to return in grief and vexation, he thought it advisable to wait until passions had calmed down in Corinth. In his view, then, it was an act of mercy to avoid a premature meeting, and leave the church time for reform. His immediate appearance would inevitably lead to a rupture. He would then be compelled to extend to others the punishment he had pronounced upon one; perhaps to provoke an irremediable breach. So he could call God to witness that it was out of mercy he had not come to Corinth, mercy towards him who had provoked the whole quarrel. For though he made the sinner responsible for the distress, it was only to be gladdened by his reform.[2] Besides, Paul had to leave both him and the rest time, for his office was to build up, and not to cast down. This was an excuse the church would scarcely have put forward for itself. But the simple course of events brought reconciliation. At this very moment Paul underwent a "proof" at Ephesus, which was known to the church before he sent them the last letter which remains to us (2 Cor. i.—ix.).

Once more the Apostle was found to prove with his blood and at peril of his life that he was pre-eminently a minister of Christ under persecution.[3] He had been compelled to quit Ephesus after facing death in a most fearful form.[4] Threatened unceasingly, he escaped to Troas, where Titus was to meet him. But, coming there before he intended, he missed Titus. He even reached Macedonia before him, and there fell in with Timothy,

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 1.
[2] 2 Cor. ii. 3.
[3] 2 Cor. i. 8—10.
[4] 2 Cor. i. 9, 10.

who had not indeed returned from Corinth, but in all probability had not yet set out upon his mission. Not only has he no news to give of Corinth, but Paul does not even expect news from him.[1] Titus arrived at last in the month Tisri, after the new year,[2] when winter was again approaching. Seven or eight months, therefore, had passed over the country since the outset of the quarrel, so that it is not astonishing to find the situation in Corinth again materially altered. Nothing more is said of the authority who was to come from the apostles. On the other hand, we find certain who have made their appearance in the church with letters of commendation, doubtless from Jerusalem, and represent the strongly Judaistic point of view.[3] None the less, things had returned to their proper course. A little before the meeting in Macedonia, Titus had been again to Corinth. It was much against his will that he ventured a second time into this turmoil; Paul had to remind him,[4] either by letter or by word of mouth, of all the Corinthians' good qualities, before he made up his mind to this second visit. Nevertheless, all went well. If Titus had nothing but the basest calumnies to report the first time, his new visit was consoling alike for himself and for Paul.[5] The epistle, at first so offensive to the Corinthians, had gradually produced its due effect. Perhaps, too, the Corinthians were melted by the news of the terrible occurrences at Ephesus; perhaps it now seemed glorious, again, after the fashion of men, to belong to such a martyr; perhaps, though all so lately wished to be Petrine, a considerable party now shouted for Paul. In any case, the Apostle is aware that just as he was saved from "so great a death" by the prayers of many, so again many give thanks for his deliverance; and the Corinthians are reckoned among those who clasp their hands and pray God to continue

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 12, vii. 6.

[2] 2 Cor. viii. 10.

[3] 2 Cor. i. 3; obviously different from those of the four-chapter Epistle, for those of x. 18 have no letters of commendation.

[4] 2 Cor. vii. 14.

[5] 2 Cor. vii. 7.

to deliver him.[1] Indeed, Titus can tell him on a sudden what longing, what regret, what zeal, the church feels towards him.

At this moment, when they feel themselves threatened with the loss of the Apostle, it dawned upon them what manner of man he was, and what they possessed in him. Now that the soil was broken, the seed of the first epistle grew up by degrees. The members of the church began "with diligence" to think of ending this reprehensible disorder. Each began to excuse himself, and, with the turn of the tide, cast the entire burden of their ill-will upon those who had exposed them to this loss. Their fear of the Apostle's anger, their longing after him and zeal for him, were also manifested in the proceedings taken to chastise the incestuous criminal. Now the penalty imposed by the will of the majority upon their partner in all this disturbance was, of course, not the dreadful one of consigning him to Satan, as threatened by Paul, but something milder. Yet even this bore heavily enough upon a man who, though sunk in sensuality, was far from being a hardened sinner.

In this way it was possible to feel justified before Paul, who for his part was well content. How far the present temper was removed from the former stubbornness, is shown by Titus' report; they received him with "fear and trembling," and left the rest for Paul to deal with. The whole affair was a true Greek drama, where beginning and end never fit one another. It was just as the ancient Greeks banished a statesman because they were tired of hearing him called the Just, and after a little called him back again because they could not do without him. As then, so now, the affair did not come to an end without recriminations, lamentations and tears. Paul, however, on receiving Titus' report, said, in his fine way, that he no longer regretted the letter which had caused the Corinthians such sorrow: "For godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation, a repentance which bringeth no regret; but the sorrow of the world worketh death."[3]

[1] 2 Cor. i. 11. [2] 2 Cor. vii. 11, seq. [3] 2 Cor. vii. 10.

Now that the Corinthians had given the proof of their obedience exacted by Paul, he too might confess that in something he was wrong. Infallibility is not so dear to him that he cannot say out directly: "In everything ye proved yourselves to be pure in the matter."[1] Their mildness, too, only meets with his approval. He, indeed, was not himself injured by the sinner, nor desired to interfere on behalf of the injured party. The injury was really to the whole church, and if the church forgives, then he forgives also.[2] Indeed, he exhorts them to let love deal with the sinner, to forgive and console him, so that he should not be overwhelmed with excessive tribulation. On the whole, it seems best to him not to push the matter further; it has caused sufficient division and discord, and has been turned to profit enough by certain persons. It is good, therefore, to make an end, "that no advantage," he adds significantly, "may be gained over us by Satan, for we are not ignorant of his devices."

With this, the painful situation might be considered as closed. We may very well assume that the Apostle celebrated his next visit by the restoration of the repentant sinner. As in this the Corinthians had carried out one of the Apostle's demands, so they carried out the other, namely, the collection. "Through good report and through evil report," the Apostle continues true to his purposes;[3] but how little he has henceforth to suffer from evil report, is shown by the fact that he is able once more to ask the Corinthians to join in the collection. The only result, perhaps, of the late insinuations was that Paul now obtained a formal control. Two persons specially appointed by the churches accompanied Titus when the latter found himself ready once more to set the collection in train at Corinth. This commission of three left for Corinth before Paul, in order that the gift should be ready "as a matter of bounty and not of extortion." Higgling and chaffering are not to begin anew when Paul comes

[1] 2 Cor. vii. 11.

[2] 2 Cor. ii. 4—11.

[3] 2 Cor. vi. 7.

with the Macedonians; the whole affair is to be settled once for all, as suits its lofty purpose.[1]

The position now reached in the practical questions serves to show how the unnatural supremacy of the Judaists broke down after a brief triumph, and even the new arrivals from Jerusalem, letters of commendation and all, were thrown into the shade. The very fact of their arrival at the moment when Paul was proceeding materially to relieve the ruin of their own home, must have blunted their opposition, while the dogmatic differences between them and Paul were at least not personal. The antithesis separating them was between his heavenly and their earthly Christ; his spiritual gospel and their stony doctrine of the law, based on the letter; between the ministry of life and the ministry of death. Paul touches briefly on his doctrine of the new Adam who is in heaven, a doctrine probably known already to the Corinthians, and therefore not justified at any length.[2]

Besides his new opponents, with their letters of commendation, the old adversaries still hold their ground, and, unmoved by his fate at Ephesus, continue to maintain that he broke his word, that he failed to come, and declined the contest.[3] For it is always the character of rigid dogmatism to remain inaccessible to every moral sentiment. Even in the last shorter Epistle, which cannot be read without emotion after all these centuries, the adversaries found a great deal to find fault with and sneer at. Paul draws a picture of his sufferings and persecutions that would have melted a stone; they whisper in the church that he is commending himself.[4] He lifts the veil for a moment from the sanctity of his visionary hours; they suggest that he is not quite sane.[5] But when in the same breath they declare that he persuades men,[6] it may be taken as a reassuring sign that the support of the church is failing them. For it was always the

[1] 2 Cor. viii. 16, seq.
[2] Cf. 2 Cor. iii. and iv.
[3] 2 Cor. i. 16, seq.
[4] 2 Cor. iii. 1.
[5] 2 Cor. v. 13.
[6] 2 Cor. v. 11.

way in primitive Christianity, that the churches were better than the leaders of their theological sects; and while those who boast themselves to belong in a peculiar sense to Christ, cast malicious doubts upon Paul's tale of suffering, the latter might rest in perfect confidence that the labourers and slaves of Cenchreæ, Corinth and Schœnus, were capable of finer feeling than those who were permitted "to know Christ after the flesh."

Thus the Apostle was enabled to vindicate triumphantly his rights as an apostle before the party of Peter and Christ and their allies armed with letters of commendation. He and his friends will continue to carry on their ministry: "In the word of truth, in the power of God; by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by glory and dishonour, by evil report and good report; as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, yet possessing all things." So all discord is drowned in the triumphant harmony of godly joy, the key-note of this enthusiastic soul. He has so wide, so generous a temper, after all the trivialities and pettinesses that have gone before: "Our mouth is open unto you, O Corinthians," he cries; "our heart is enlarged. Now for a recompense in like kind (I speak as unto my children) be ye also enlarged." And they were enlarged; they opened to him. The very Judaists could not change them. In his own way Paul had vanquished evil by good.

In the course of the winter, 58-59, Paul followed the brethren who had been sent on before. We learn from the Epistle to the Romans that he took up his abode in the house of the brother Gaius, where he found rest and peace of mind, which enabled him to develop his attitude towards the Jewish law at some length to the Christian church of Rome. Judging from the tone of the work written here, he was perfectly successful in overcoming all elements of opposition. In a man of his temperament, the contrary would have produced complaints either in

the Epistle to the Romans or in the letters of recommendation for Phœbe to take to Ephesus, which also were written here.[1] The salutations, also, which he conveys are a positive token that he maintained an excellent understanding with at least the heads of the church, Jason, Sosipater, Gaius, Erastus, Lucius, Tertius, Quartus and others.

The triumph of his side is further betokened by the fact that he claims the victory of Gentile Christianity over the unbelieving Jews more than ever in his new writings, and resumes old plans.[2] Here in *Corinthus bimaris*, where the ships of Britain and Spain met those of Egypt and Asia as they passed in and out, he was seized by his old impulse to press onwards. He resolved to seek a new field of activity, and the idea of a journey to Rome took strong hold upon him. But unless he were content to abandon the whole results of his work in the East and among the Greeks, it was first necessary to arrive at an understanding with those of Jerusalem, so as to put an end at length to the aggressions he had experienced in the last five years. Another journey to Jerusalem was necessary, in order to effect a settlement with the apostles in person. Yet at this moment a visit to the Holy City was not free from danger.

The passionate stirring of the Jewish Dispersion was but the distant offset from the tremendous storm that raged in the home of Judaism, and was to bring about its political dissolution. The city was confronted by the prospect of war, which might break out at any moment. All the more dangerous, therefore, for Paul to be in Jerusalem at the approaching feast, when the whole excited people gathered together in the city. Once recognized as the man who had led so many to fall away from the law, his life would not be worth a moment's purchase. Even if the populace did not tear him in pieces, who would protect him from the daggers of the assassins who sought for victims in the throng?

Paul's determination, nevertheless, to go up to Jerusalem

[1] Rom. xvi. 1, seq. [2] Rom. i. 13.

only shows how indispensable he considered it to arrive at an understanding with the parent church, and secure the East before essaying the West. At this moment, more than at any other, he hoped for a satisfactory settlement of disputes; for the result of many years' labour lay before him in the collection which he could hand over in Jerusalem in the name of the churches of Gentile Christians. A great part of his efforts, and, above all, of his persecutions, had been due to this collection of money. He had taught the Galatians to tax themselves; he fired the Macedonians with the example of the Corinthians, and stimulated the Corinthians to contribute by sending word through his own brother of Macedonian envoys who would probably look over their collection. The hesitating he cheered with the assurance that in case of their own necessity the other churches would come to their aid; in short, he shrank from no trouble, no rebuff, no suspicion, to which an undertaking of this sort is exposed.[1] Now the whole sum was gathered together, and Paul must have been very different from what he really was if fear were to make him let another convey the collection which he had designed from the very beginning as a peace-offering to conciliate the parent church to the Dispersion.[2] So he went forward into the vortex of Jewish disorder, by which even he was seized and carried away.

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 1—6. [2] 2 Cor. viii. ix.

Fifth Division.

NERO.

NERO.

1. The New Régime.

The 13th October, 54, while Paul was working in Corinth, saw the death of the emperor Claudius. True that loud complaints had been raised against his government; yet they applied more to his evil surroundings than to his person, so that the news of his death, attended as it was by monstrous circumstances, struck terror into the provinces. All the worst ordinances of the late period were ascribed to the empress Agrippina, Caligula's sister, while her opponent, Narcissus, was regarded as the best of Claudius' advisers. And now Agrippina's son assumed the government, by virtue of his predecessor's nomination and the ratification of the prætorians.

Nero's earliest youth had been passed among the vices of the imperial court. His father, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, had separated from Agrippina, who shared the dishonour of Caligula's sisters. He died in the year 40, after his wife had been sent into exile. His son found shelter with a kinswoman, the wanton Domitia Lepida, worthy mother of the notorious Messalina. On the principle, common to several great houses, of making pedagogues of those slaves who had leisure or were fit for nothing else,[1] a dancer and a barber took charge of Nero's education.[2] Hatred of the mother who had ruined his home was early inculcated.[3] Meanwhile, the murder of Caligula on Jan. 24, 41, brought Agrippina back to Rome, where before long she gave her son a new father in the intellectual orator Crispus Passienus.

[1] Tac. Dial. 28. [2] Sueton. Nero, 5, 6. [3] Tac. Ann. xii. 64.

Passienus also dying, Agrippina engrossed herself in schemes upon the throne. Such were the earliest impressions made upon the boy. He soon distinguished himself by his lively behaviour and gift of oratory. These being rapidly developed by a hurried training in comedy and by the example of his step-father Passienus and his teacher Ascanius Labeo,[1] his general capacity, in reality but mediocre, was greatly exaggerated.

But the blood of Germanicus ran in his veins, and the populace, therefore, preferred him to Britannicus, the heir to the imperial throne. His mother's struggle with Messalina ended in 47 with the fall of the fickle empress: and while the palace officials, Narcissus, Callistus and Pallas, anxiously took steps towards the emperor's re-marriage, Agrippina caught the amorous old man in her toils, and, with the aid of Lucius Vitellius, brought the senate to sanction a marriage with her uncle in the beginning of 49. The betrothal of her son to the emperor's daughter Octavia gave the young Ahenobarbus almost the same claim to the succession as Britannicus, who was his junior by a year. Meanwhile, this remarkable woman resolved for a time to rule in person. From her entry into the palace the government assumed another character. Greater energy was displayed in foreign policy, and greater strictness in dealing with the provinces. The danger of the new arrangement, however, lay within the palace itself, where the quarrel between the mothers only ended to make way for the quarrel between the sons. In the eyes of the court, Britannicus, the son of Claudius and Messalina, was the heir of the Julian house; Agrippina's son, the young Ahenobarbus, was really no more than a Domitius. In the struggle for the succession, Nero's more brilliant gifts were now to turn the scale. His entire bent was towards the things in which his talents so completely eclipsed Britannicus.

Art, and not education, being the sole requirement in a teacher, the choice fell upon Greeks, who gave the young prince his love for the Greek theatre, which was afterwards so repug-

[1] Tac. Ann. xiii. 10; Juv. Sat. vii. 137.

nant to the Romans. The Greek Burrus was known from his dealings with the Jews to make a practice of selling his influence at court.[1] The other tutor, Anicetus, was a perfect rascal, who plays his part in every one of Nero's later atrocities. He it was who murdered Nero's mother, and finally, by his shameless avowal of adultery with Octavia, brought her unhappy existence to an end.

Such were the tutors to whose assistance Annæus Seneca was called in—Seneca, the first of his day in literature, oratory and philosophy. He was recalled from exile, into which he had been sent by Messalina, to conduct the education of young Ahenobarbus. Seneca's brother Gallio also came into favour. Both measures were popular, and strengthened Agrippina's position. The one scholar soon called in two others to help him, Alexander of Ægæ and Chæremon. Thus forced, Nero's education soon bore due fruit. Painting, singing, sculpture, poetry, music, and practice in charioteering, claimed the entire interests of the prince, when a military education alone would have been suitable. The natural consequences of this education soon developed in the boy; he became *blasé* and desultory, caring for nothing but a shallow dilettantism.[2] Besides, Seneca fancied his vocation was for higher things than teaching boys. To be sure, on assuming his office, he published a kind of educational programme. His pedagogical treatises permitted the public to share his delight in the Stoic maxims he impressed upon his pupil. But while attributing his small success to the inborn intractability of his pupil, he employed his position at court to meddle in the government.[3]

This could but help Agrippina's schemes. Government in the name of Germanicus' grandson, by the wisest man of the time, or at least the greatest student of wisdom, seemed to the Romans a far more inviting prospect than the continuance of a govern-

[1] Jos. Ant. xx. 8, 9.

[2] Schiller, Geschichte des röm. Kaiserrechts unter Nero, p. 69, 294, seq.

[3] Sueton. Nero, 7.

ment by freedmen at the pleasure of the youthful Britannicus. Agrippina further succeeded in dividing the emperor's own suspicions. Pallas sided with Nero; Narcissus, though he had overthrown Messalina, remained faithful to Britannicus.[1] But Agrippina prevailed. On Feb. 25, 50, Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus was adopted into the Claudian *gens* under the name of Nero Claudius Cæsar Drusus Germanicus. By March, 51, he was raised to the rank of *princeps juventutis* and consul designate with proconsular rank.

All this only served to still further inflame the fantastic ambition of the boy of fourteen.[2] A speech of thanks, well learned and well recited, earned the first rounds of applause for which he afterwards developed such a passion. A parade of the prætorians and a liberal donative soon won the guard also to his side. Their fidelity was completely assured by the appointment of a new prefect, Afranius Burrus, who owed his advancement to Agrippina. From time to time Nero appeared before the emperor's throne or the senate to plead for some cause or another in a Latin or a Greek oration, and proved to the world at large that no boy of his own age equalled him in this form of exercitation. Early in the year 53, at the age of fifteen, he was married to his bride of thirteen, Octavia, the daughter of Claudius. The minister Narcissus, whose peril increased every day, offered more and more strenuous resistance. The emperor, too, suffered temporary relapses. At this point an illness at the baths of Sinuessa carried off this suspicious guardian of his prince, and Agrippina gained the opportunity of establishing her son by the murder of her husband. The emperor was given a poisonous agaric. When he noticed the effects of the poison, he was conveyed to bed as if intoxicated; and there, under the show of tender ministrations, the unnatural wife completed her work.

Never was a man, harmless in himself, more basely done to death. But the learning and philosophy of Agrippina's court

[1] Tac. Ann. xii. 25. [2] Schiller, Nero, p. 72.

were exhausted in witticisms on the humours of his death. The last words of Claudius, the world was informed, were: "I have defiled myself."[1] Gallio cried that the deified prince had been haled up to heaven with hooks; Seneca indited his "Pumpkinisation" of the divine Claudius; and the young Nero soon discovered agarics to be a dish of the gods, for his stepfather Claudius had turned into a god by eating them.[2] To the public, however, appearances were kept up officially. Claudius was enrolled among the gods; Seneca himself composed the grandiose funeral oration pronounced by Nero. But as if to make up for the compulsion he had put upon himself, our scholar, still unsatisfied with his previous severity towards Claudius, read his lampoon, the Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii, immediately after the panegyric. The very title is an unseemly jest on the method of the murder, and the entire production a melancholy sign how little all the bombast of Stoic maxims of morality really went for.

"At the beginning of a most blessed age," the pamphlet purposes to inform the world at large how after his apotheosis, ministerially completed by Seneca, Claudius was received into Olympus by the gods. Mercury had long since told the fate Clotho that she might cut short the thread of the emperor's life:

> "To him death; to a better prince the throne."

Clotho at last follows this advice, in order that Greeks and Gauls, Spaniards and Britons, should no longer be given the franchise and admitted into the Senate. So Claudius' thread is broken; but Lachesis spins Nero's silken thread, while Phœbus chants:

> "Let him overpass
> The span of mortal years, Prince with my face,
> My fairness; skilled as I in speech and song.
> He brings an age of joy to mortal men,
> And breaks the silence that held Justice dumb.
> Now, Rome, thy sovereign comes, and thou shalt see
> Thy Nero; bright his glance with gentle fire,
> Proud springs his neck beneath his curling hair."

[1] Seneca, Apocol. 4.

[2] Dio, lx. 55.

While the gods thus hailed the new star, Claudius appears before the gate and demands admittance. He limps; he speaks indistinctly. Since the fit of fever, which sticks to him even in Olympus, he is a Gaul, for he was born at Lugdunum. Even in heaven he talks as coarsely as if he had only to do with freedmen. So the gods take counsel together whether they shall treat the new-comer as a god. He cannot represent an Epicurean god, who neither does anything himself, nor has anything done by others; for, lazy as he is, he is fond of giving orders. He has no leanings towards a Stoic god either; for, according to Varro, such a god has neither head nor foreskin.

Still, some gods declare for him. First of all, Hercules, the barbarians' friend; then Janus, the ambiguous; Plutus, the god of skinflints; until Augustus comes forward to complain of all the harm he has done to his own house. Persuaded by the great Augustus' politic speech, Olympus finally resolves that Mercury shall turn the fellow away, and lead him off to the lower world. While Claudius, thus accompanied, is passing along the *Via Sacra*, he meets his own funeral procession on earth, where songs are sung to his godhead; yet no one is really sorry except the advocates, whom Claudius helped to a livelihood by his pettifogging ways. Fain would the dead man have lingered to hear the triumphant anapæsts in which his deeds were celebrated; but Mercury stretched forth his divine hand, and made him pass through the arch of the cloaca into the underworld, where he is met by Narcissus, who was murdered by Agrippina, but had not needed to make a detour by Olympus.

Such were the words of Seneca, who had actually written the funeral oration on Claudius, and paid him the last honours among the mourners on the *Via Sacra*. It is a characteristic trait of the moral nature of the men who now assumed the reins of power. No wonder that, in spite of all the harm done to the empire by the freedmen's administration, men could only speak with amazement of the change that banished the servant to restore the noble. The leading spirit of the new administration

was Seneca. He instructed the youthful Cæsar utterly and instantly to reject Agrippina's claims to a share in the regency; he determined him to go beyond Claudius in giving the Senate a share in the government: and the speech from the throne, composed by Seneca, pilloried the participation of freedmen and women in the government in unmistakable allusions. The prerogatives of the utterly corrupt aristocracy were to be restored on the proposal of the two Annæi, Seneca and Gallio, who sprang from the equestrian order.

The new régime was not wanting in popularity. The Annæi were a respectable, if not a notable family. M. Annæus Seneca the elder, and his excellent wife Helvia, were the type of a cultured household, in which the tendencies of the Augustan age survived. Their only son, L. Annæus Mela, the geographer, and his son Lucan, the popular poet of the Pharsalia, were the favourites of the literary world. Annæus Novatus, adopted by the orator L. Junius Gallio, had been a popular official as proconsul of Achaia before entering the administration. Seneca himself, the master of high-sounding commonplace, knew better than any other how to popularize the broad results of Stoicism, to re-cast shallow controversies into sententious treatises full of fine phrases and antitheses, and was admitted to rank as the first author of his time. Taken together, the family represented the literary aftermath of a great period; and if an aristocratic government should follow the rule of the freedmen, the Annæi, though only of equestrian birth, would have well-founded claims upon it.

Meanwhile, the supposition that philosophers had a special vocation for government, once more proved false. It was a government of talk, fond of theatrical effects and uncertain in politics, which were directed by Seneca. But most questionable of all was the personal honour of the chief minister. The question has often been asked, how Seneca's pupil could have turned out a Nero. Critics who were nearer to him inquired more curiously, how the first moralist of all time could be a Seneca.

Dio Cassius[1] expresses the question as follows—somewhat rhetorically, indeed, yet not out of keeping with his predecessors: "Seneca, the teacher of virtue, was banished by Claudius for an intrigue with Julia, and afterwards lived in adultery with Agrippina. But it was not in this alone that his life utterly contradicted his philosophy. He denounced tyrants, and was the tutor of a tyrant; he sneered at the companions of kings, and was never away from the palace. He attacked flatterers, and paid such court to Messalina and the freedmen that he afterwards suppressed the works on this subject. He blamed the rich, and amassed 75,000,000 denarii (£2,500,000): he bewails luxury, and to entertain his friends owned a set of five hundred sandal-wood tables with legs of ivory. Finally, he was a preacher of morals who kept boys for his pleasure, and even initiated Nero into such courses." Though much of this declamation may be exaggerated, the main lines of the sketch are accurate. He was indeed charged in open court with his adultery with Julia and Agrippina. In the same way, a prisoner asked what kind of philosophy enabled Seneca to put by 300,000,000 sesterces in four years.[2] If he was thus spoken of in the height of his power, he was judged without mercy when his influence waned.[3]

As to the young emperor himself, he took over a monarchical power, firmly established by four reigns, without feeling any serious interest in it. Among a varied host of petty talents, Nero lacked any political or military vein, while his education was that of an artist rather than a ruler. He took pleasure in the shallowest dilettantism and the most corrupt pleasures. He only mingled in business when he fancied himself personally threatened. The consequence was, that the will of the Senate once more became of importance, in return for which the Fathers developed two-fold servility in all personal concerns of their sovereign.

While his best policy was to establish and confirm the traditions of personal government, the young prince flung himself

[1] lxi. 10. [2] Tac. Ann. xiii. 42, 43. [3] Ann. xiv. 52.

into the noble art of harp-playing, and was fired with a romantic passion for the freedwoman Acte, to whom he devoted his time, his thoughts and his powers. Seneca furthered a mode of life which left his own statecraft to represent the emperor's will, and at the same time day by day separated the youthful emperor further from his masculine mother.[1] The dismissal of Pallas in 56 from the direction of finance told the world that Agrippina's rule was at an end; while the cold-blooded murder of Britannicus not only deprived the Claudian party of their mainstay, but told, with no ambiguous sound, what might be expected from the "virtuous" régime of the God-fearing Stoic. The treatise, De Clementia, "On Mercy," which the minister now addressed to Nero—the finest, perhaps, of his writings—was intended to obliterate the bad impression of Seneca produced by the disinheritance and murder of the last of the Claudii.[2]

The administration meanwhile went on its course: foreign affairs under the strong hand of Afranius Burrus, home politics under the less secure guidance of the philosopher. Nothing was now heard of the emperor except through nocturnal escapades, street adventures, and his share in the factions of the theatre. Then the year 57 brought a change in his mistresses. After three years the young debauchee grew tired of his Arcadian pastoral with Acte. The place of the flower-girl was taken by a lady of the great world, a granddaughter of the famous general, Poppæus Sabinus. The Cæsar took her from his friend Otho, giving the province of Lusitania in exchange. The proud beauty was absolute sovereign of the sensuous boy; but she wished to be Augusta, and therefore Agrippina and Octavia must fall. Now the removal of the intriguing and wilful mother was not only desired by Poppæa, but by Seneca and Burrus; while constant warnings against her plots inflamed the mind of the emperor and prepared him for matricide. A coward from lust and cruelty, his consent was the outcome of genuine fear, worked upon perpetually by Seneca himself;[3] due, also, to his un-

[1] Tac. Ann. xiii. 14. [2] Ibid. xiii. 16—18. [3] De Clem. i. 8.

bridled desire, for Poppæa withheld her favours until she should be made his consort, an end unattainable while Agrippina lived. The tutor Anicetus lent his aid for the crime. Seneca had recognized that this Greek was versed in other things besides instruction in the fine arts, and had given him command of the fleet at Misenum. To this place Nero inveigled his mother; Anicetus was to scuttle her ship and let her drown. But the attempt failed. The heroic woman saved herself by swimming. Neither Nero nor Seneca and Burrus could avoid the necessity of issuing direct orders for her murder; while Seneca was forced to employ his pen in informing the Senate that Agrippina had committed suicide on the discovery of her plots against her son.[1] The Fathers united in thanking Seneca for Nero's preservation; but a crime so unheard-of, condemned by every nation and every age, proved too great a burden for the poltroon who had undertaken it. Familiarity with poetry, music and women, had excited the imagination of the unhappy youth too deeply for him to shake off the impressions of this day of horror. He, the friend of Greek tragedy, now in his turn became an Orestes pursued by the Furies, seeking to stupefy himself in religious exercises and noisy pleasures. His courtiers congratulated him; but, says Tacitus, Nature did not change her aspect like men, and he fled from her accusing look. Rumour said that he heard the blasts of trumpets from the surrounding hills, and voices from his mother's grave. There were also reports of prodigies, whose meaning was easy to interpret. A woman gave birth to a serpent; a wife was struck dead by lightning in her husband's arms. Nero himself called in sorcerers to appease the shade of his victim by sacrifice to the dead.

But his terror remained. His mother's shade and blazing torches and scourges betokened to him the presence of the avenging goddesses.[2] For years afterwards, his fear of the Erinnyes forbade him to visit the Eleusinian mysteries; he was

[1] Tac. Ann. xiv. 10, 11; Suet. N. 34; Dio, lxi. 14.

[2] Suet. N. 35; Punishment of Matricide, Juv. Sat. viii. 211.

terrified by the herald's proclamation, warning away all who bore the stain of blood.[1] To crown all, a strange and fiery comet appeared in the year 60. He trembled for his life, and inquired of Babilus the astrologer against whom it was directed. Babilus advised him to forestall the stroke of the portent, and divert the threatened misfortune to others by giving orders for a series of executions. Thus he plunged deeper and deeper into blood.

Poppæa, meantime, found consolation in converse with the Jews. Josephus, at least, calls her a God-fearing woman in the Jews' sense. She showed herself obedient to notable professors of the law; and it was probably through faith in the God of Abraham that she finally gave orders for her corpse to be disposed of with Oriental rites.[2] At last the rival congratulations of officers, senators and municipalities upon his crime, drew Nero from the solitude in which he would have preferred to bury himself. When Senate and municipalities vied with one another in erecting altars of thanksgiving and lavishing abuse upon the murdered woman, he finally ventured to appear once more in the city, where he was received with greater rejoicings than ever. Nero himself was astounded at the fact, and is reported to have said that no Cæsar in former days knew how much was permitted him.

Nevertheless, a number of decrees of amnesty betoken his uneasy mind. One result of this temper was that the emperor sought diversion in the clamour of public festivals, no longer as a spectator, but as a performer. If Rome praised his matricide, what admiration would not greet his harp-playing? But this was the very point on which public opinion first declared against him. To put men to death was not counter to Roman habits, while harp-playing was. This was the first time the emperor attempted to acclimatize foreign ways in Rome. His Greek tutors had taught him to prefer the cheerful games of Elis and Corinth to the

[1] Suet. Nero, 35.

[2] Jos. Vit. 3; Ant. xx. 8, 11; 11, 1; Tac. Ann. xvi. 6.

bloody fights of gladiators or wild beasts in which the Latins revelled. Inclination, now perhaps supported by a religious turn, urged him to have the courage of his convictions. His assumption of the *toga virilis* in 59 was for the first time to be celebrated with games in which there was a contest, not of fisticuffs, but of fine art. The Roman youth of either sex were bidden prepare to appear in the circus, the orchestra and the amphitheatre, to play the flute, to dance, and sing to the cither.

It seemed unheard-of for the descendants of a Paulus, a Mummius or an Appius, to pit themselves against freedmen and women-slaves in their pursuits; but even Seneca and his brother Gallio were not excused from taking part. The emperor had the theatre of Gaius on the Vatican restored; Gallio, as herald, proclaimed the appearance of the emperor; and in the ordinary humble posture of a harper, the lord of the world craved an attentive hearing. Beside him as he recited stood Seneca as prompter, while Burrus bore the lute.[1] The assembly wearied their arms with clapping, which was afterwards distinguished according to strength as "buzzing," "pantiles" and "potsherds."[2]

In the year 60, the fifth of his reign, he proceeded to found Neronian games, to be celebrated every five years. But the murder of his mother left such a deep impression on his mind that the next two years were almost uneventful. The access of his mental disorder is proved, not only by his noisy festivals, but also by his regard for prodigies and terror at the comet, which tortured him day and night for six months of the year 60. Seneca found leisure to write a long explanation of the nature of a comet,[3] in particular combating the view of there being any special significance in the fact that Claudius' comet constantly mounted upwards, while the comet of Nero's auspicious régime before long began to sink. "The comet"—such was his explanation—"has no fixed course, but, like all fire, glides along where it finds fuel."[4] "Consider, moreover, no one knows what a comet

[1] Suet. Nero, 21.
[2] Ibid. 20.
[3] Quæst. Nat. vii. 16—32.
[4] Ibid. vii. 21, 29.

is, and therefore knows still less what it signifies. If, however, the study of philosophy were not relegated to wet days (a remark clearly addressed to Nero the pupil) or the 'close time' for games, no one would let himself be troubled about such things."[1]

Such was the comfortless course of events till the year 62, in which a natural death or assassination rid the emperor of Burrus, the only man who could keep him in check. Afranius Burrus not unfrequently let Nero know he was his own creation. "I will not be asked twice about the same thing," said he on occasion to the disobedient boy. When the Cæsar paid him a visit in his last illness, he turned his face to the wall, and only replied that it was well with him, from which the bystanders inferred that he considered Nero his murderer. He at all events had prevented the divorce from Octavia, for Nero's claim to the throne rested on this marriage. When Nero pressed him once more on the subject of divorce from the daughter of Claudius, he retorted, "Then give her back her dowry," the empire.

The choice of his military successor was settled by Poppæa, whose relationship to Otho made her well acquainted with all the officers of the body-guard. The prefect's power was divided. The chief position was given to Sophonius Tigellinus, a rude soldier and man of pleasure; the other, to Faenius Rufus, who soon entered Piso's conspiracy, which was already afoot. Seneca, deprived of Burrus, was unable to play his part successfully. Violent executions, on which his advice had never been asked, showed him it was time to withdraw. He tendered his resignation of the treasury, and begged permission to retire. But Nero's cowardice feared the bad impression such an act would leave. Both requests were rejected; still the philosopher, on the pretext of illness, withdrew more and more from the court in hopes that an inoffensive life would bring oblivion.

Slight as his influence had been, nevertheless it was perceived that Tigellinus now ruled in place of himself and Burrus. Now

[1] Quæst. Nat. vii. 32.

at last Poppæa might hope for the consummation of her nuptials. A scandalous suit was forced on; and when, on a false report that Nero, touched by her innocence, had been reconciled to Octavia, the popular fury wreaked itself on the statues and property of Poppæa, Octavia was banished to Pandataria. Finally, the pedagogue Anicetus, with brazen front, declared that he had committed adultery with Octavia, whereupon the unhappy princess was put to death. Poppæa now became Augusta; and her infant daughter dying at the age of three months, was placed among the divæ, and given a temple and a college of priests.

The accession of Poppæa and Tigellinus marks the beginning of the magnificent disorders of Nero's government, the fantastic madness of which even surpasses the follies of Caligula. Goaded on, as it were, by evil spirits, the enervated prince rushed from one vortex of pleasure to the next. The most scandalous proceedings went on, with antique absence of disguise, before the eyes of all Rome. Plebs and aristocracy were seized with the same bacchanalian riotousness. The public orgies of Tigellinus, the burning of the city, the persecution of the Christians, are but the closing scene of a period of madness. The prefect of the prætorians, with his garrison, guaranteed the existence of the emperor, and directed the course of politics for him. The conspiracy of Piso, which was prefaced and prepared so long, until discovered in the year 65, is but a slight symptom of reaction against this wanton government on the part of the moribund political sense of the aristocracy. But this aristocracy was little better than the court. Any political movement emanating from it is marked from beginning to end by the crudest self-seeking and narrow party-interest.

The same spirit of reaction stamps every legislative enactment of the Senate during this period. The lower grades of lawyers were given work, but forbidden to accept fees;[1] the aristocracy, on the contrary, received the administration of the highest offices with relief from the burdens attaching to them.[2] The tribunician

[1] Tac. Ann. xv. 20, xiii. 42. [2] Ibid. xiii. 5.

power, shadow as it was, was still further limited; a law proposes to make the emancipation of a slave revocable for ingratitude on the part of the *libertus*.[1] For the murder of a tyrannical master by a slave, the Senate insists on the enforcement of an antiquated and barbarous penalty, whereby the whole household was put to death and four hundred slaves slaughtered for the crime of one.[2] The refusal of the customary vote of thanks from the provincials to their proconsuls provoked overbearing action in the Senate;[3] and of many complaints against extortion, most were quashed, sometimes with punishment of the complainants.[4]

Scarcely had the much decried imperial government given way to senatorial government, than everything was plunged anew into the shameless disorder of Sulla's day. Now this temper in the Senate was specially harmful to the provincials, because the emperor only interfered in the administration of the provinces committed to the Senate in cases of extreme need. On the other hand, some of the imperial provinces groaned under the creatures of the money-hunting Pallas. Nero himself, whose imagination was not devoid of good purposes, would willingly have lent them aid. He pondered, Tacitus tells us,[5] whether he should not remit all indirect taxes, and so make the most honourable present to the human kind. His venturesome plan was wrecked on the objections of the officials and the moneyed aristocracy, who made tax-farming the field of their speculations.[6] The one thing he effected was the publication of the taxation-lists, which put some check upon arbitrary proceedings. Arrears of more than a year's standing were to be abolished, and complaints against tax-farmers to have precedence over other causes.

But it is only too clear, from the growing complaints of the

[1] Tac. Ann. xiii. 26. [2] Ibid. xiii. 32. [3] Ibid. xv. 22.
[4] Ibid. xiii. 30, 33, 52, xiv. 18, 46; Hist. i. 77.
[5] Ann. xiii. 50, 51; Schiller, Nero, 348.
[6] Mommsen, Röm. Munz. Wes. 753, seq. Schiller, Nero, 350, seq.

provincials, that these reforms were never carried out under the degenerate government. Moreover, while such repressive measures failed to end the wrongs even of the imperial provinces, the universal misery was increased by the insane mismanagement of the coinage. Nero was the first to coin silver below its nominal value,[1] consequently destroying the fixed value of the silver coinage; while his arbitrary alternations of hoarding and spending money produced all possible harm in trade and commerce. The vast scale on which the corn countries were exploited for the benefit of the capital, raised the cost of living for the provincials, noticeably in Palestine, a province attached to the imperial province of Egypt.[2] Add to this the expense of the British and Parthian wars, the endless demands of the prætorians, and the maintenance of the court, the cost of which may be judged from one example, viz., that the reception of Tiridates cost 416,000,000 sesterces.[3] Considering, further, that a wise man like Seneca, who wrote an essay on the happiness of poverty, amassed 300,000,000 sesterces in four years, it may be imagined what a drain upon the empire were such men as Tigellinus, Helius, Anicetus and Nymphidius, who had no desire for the fame of a Stoic.[4] Altogether, Nero must have given 2200,000,000 sesterces in presents to his friends;[5] and Vespasian demanded restoration to the treasury of £300,000,000, to replace buildings, furniture, slaves, &c., which had been squandered.[6] The burden of this colossal waste naturally fell, not upon the city, but upon the provinces; and the next thing is to show how a reaction set in against this system in the East, more especially in Judæa.

[1] Tac. Ann. xv. 18, 39, 72. [2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. xvi. 23; Suet. Nero, 30; Dio, lxiii. 2, 6.
[4] Tac. Hist. i. 37; Plin. H. N. xviii. 7.
[5] Tac. Hist. i. 20. [6] Suet. Vesp. 16.

2. The Situation in Judæa.

While the great power of the West was a prey to all the evils which a kingdom can suffer from a corrupt capital, a corrupt sovereign and an insecure succession, her neighbour in the East had grown considerably stronger. Vologæses, king of the Parthians, the twenty-third Arsacid, had overthrown the pretenders who split up the unity of the Parthian power; and after his brother Pacorus gained the throne of the Medes, the whole territory east of the Euphrates and south of the Caspian as far as the mountains of Central Asia, now came into the possession of the Parthians.[1] The Arsacids next hankered after Armenia, which Vologæses demanded for his brother Tiridates. It was long since the great power of the East had come forward so imperiously. A third Parthian dynasty in Armenia could not but appear a direct menace to Syria and Hither Asia. As a matter of fact, the Parthians invaded Armenia in 54, and expelled Rhadamistus, whom the Romans had set up. This aggression brought on hostilities, for the Jewish king, Agrippa II., and Antiochus of Commagene were bound to declare war on the crossing of the Euphrates. "The two kings, Agrippa and Antiochus, our old allies, were bound to furnish forces," says Tacitus, "to make a diversion by invading Parthia. At the same time the bridges over the Euphrates were to be cut."[2]

In the year 48, Chalcis had been bestowed upon Herod Agrippa's son by Claudius, in compensation for the loss of his paternal inheritance. In the last years of Claudius he had exchanged Philip's tetrarchy and the royal title for the principality of the Lebanon. Now that his aid was expected against the Parthians, Nero added Abila, Galilee, and fourteen villages of Peræa, to his territories. Now was his opportunity to show his loyalty and address; perhaps to get back the whole of Judæa; for Burrus and Seneca were inclined to revive Augustus' policy of establishing comparatively strong states on the eastern fron-

[1] Cf. Schiller, Nero, 414, seq.

[2] Tac. Ann. xiii. 7.

tier. Another Jewish prince, Aristobulus of Lesser Armenia, Agrippa's cousin, and son of Herod of Chalcis, who died in 48, was charged to watch the western passes of Armenia.

It was soon apparent that foreign politics were in the strong hand of Burrus; for the military arrangements left nothing to be desired. The chief command was entrusted to Domitius Corbulo, who had proved himself a gallant general in Germany. The campaign was short. A few hostile demonstrations, together with internal disturbances, determined Vologæses to evacuate Armenia, and Nero celebrated his first triumph over the Parthians. But the war broke out afresh early in 58. Tiridates again made himself master of Armenia, and Corbulo, who was taken at a disadvantage, called up the vassal kings from the south and the allied Iberians from the north, into Armenia. Thus outflanking the enemy on either side, he advanced and drove him back into the east. By April, 59, Corbulo had taken the capital, Artaxata, and in the summer, Tigranocerta. A fresh invasion of Tiridates in the following year was repelled by Corbulo with equal success. On this, the general was enabled to report that Armenia was subdued, the Parthian party punished, and the country waiting to accept a vassal king.

In making choice of a prince, Seneca's government remembered the loyal kindred of Agrippa; Tigranes, a great-grandson of king Archelaus of Cappadocia and Herod the Great, and grandson of Glaphyra,[1] was left with a small Roman guard among a discontented people, while Corbulo retreated to Syria. This was but an interlude; for as soon as the Parthians reappeared next year on the Euphrates, the Roman forces evacuated the country, and the titular king Tigranes retired with his suite to Cappadocia. True that Pætus, the governor of Cappadocia, received orders to occupy Armenia; but early in 62, his inexperience of war led to his surprise by the Parthians, who blockaded him, and only permitted his army a disgraceful retreat upon humiliating conditions.

[1] Ant. xviii. 5, 4. Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. ii. p. 30 (Eng. trans.).

For the third time Corbulo was compelled to occupy Armenia, and establish a cruel inquisition upon the nobility devoted to the Arsacids. Now at last the Parthians asked for peace. But the great military success was ill-employed. The place of Burrus had meantime been taken by the wanton régime of Tigellinus and Poppæa, whose chief pre-occupation it was to bring this protracted war to a theatrical conclusion. Tiridates was bidden lay his crown at the foot of a statue of Nero, to receive it again according to agreement from Nero's hands. Rome kept the form while sacrificing the substance. The Arsacids were allowed to rule in Armenia, but as vassals of Rome. In the year 66, Tiridates appeared in Rome to receive the kingdom from Nero instead of from Vologæses. The vassal prince established himself in Naples with a suite 3000 strong, to be conducted thence in state to the capital. Arrived at the forum, he sank on his knees and presented his petition for investiture with the crown of Armenia. Then Nero, amid the plaudits of the flattered Quirites, placed the diadem on his head. After this, games were held in the theatre of Pompey in the usual manner, except that the emperor himself appeared as a harp-player. Then Tiridates, to exhibit his native prowess, took the javelin in the bull-ring, to slay two animals at a single blow. The Romans would gladly have exchanged their Cæsar's harp for the Armenian's javelin.[1] Nero provided the Parthian with Roman architects to rebuild Artaxata, which still lay in ruins, in return for which Tiridates promised to change the name of his capital to Neronias. The upshot was that an understanding was thus established between Rome, Armenia and Parthia, resting in a special sense on the personal influence of Nero, who, indeed, long remained beloved among the Parthians, to whom he had given what they wanted.

The vicissitudes of twelve years' war left the eastern provinces deeply disturbed. No country was so directly affected by the shock as Judæa. We have seen above[2] that the financial mis-

[1] Cf. the ĕpigram in Sueton. Nero, 39. [2] Vol. ii. p. 179, seq.

management and peculation of Pallas had fallen most heavily on Judæa. One failure followed another. Early in 44, Agrippa I. died, and in rapid succession Cuspius Fadius, Tiberius Alexander and Ventidius Cumanus had been charged with the administration, and expended their strength in vainly combating popular resistance to the Gentile government. The worst treatment had been accorded to Cumanus, who assumed the procuratorship in 48. The mutual hatred of garrison and people had reached its height. So great, moreover, was the popular excitement, that the garrison of Antonia was forced to remain continually under arms during the great gatherings of the people at the festivals in Jerusalem. The troops, consequently, were not in the best of tempers; and so it happened that at the Passover of 50, when they had been on duty four days,[1] a soldier broke the monotony of his long hours of waiting by turning his back on the multitude collected in the temple, and raising a laugh among the cohort by an unseemly gesture. Incensed by such desecration of the feast, the Jews gathered in menacing and tumultuous throngs, demanding the punishment of the offender who had insulted Jehovah himself. Cumanus hesitated, and stones began to rain upon the cohort. At this, the procurator ordered up the heavy-armed troops to clear the temple, whereupon there occurred so dense a press that, according to Josephus, who is always very free with his figures, ten thousand persons were crushed to death.[2]

Rage at this new overthrow, in which the greater part of the victims did not fall by the sword, but were suffocated and trampled under foot by the throng in their mad flight from the temple, continued to seethe in the popular mind. Some hot-headed persons assaulted one of the treasury officials. The same band fell in with Stephanus, one of the king's servants, on the way to Sichem, near Bethhoron, not a hundred stades from the city, and plundered his baggage. The offenders not being discoverable, Cumanus

[1] Ant. xx. 5, 3.

[2] So Bell. ii. 12, 2; but Ant. xx. 5, 3, makes out 20,000.

ordered the neighbouring villages to be plundered, and the elders to be led off to Cæsarea and tried there. During the pillage, a soldier lighted upon a roll of the law, and, as is not difficult to understand in the circumstances, treated it with every form of contumely, finally throwing it into the fire. "The Jews," says Josephus, "thereupon were terror-stricken, as if their whole country were in a blaze. Hurried along as though automatically by religious distress, they thronged to Cæsarea in multitudes."

It was the second time that the excesses of a soldier drew down the fury of the whole nation upon the procurator. The latter resolved to make an example. The soldier paid for his ill-timed jest with his life; and the angry multitudes, appeased by his blood, dispersed. But the sentence was not only in itself inhuman, but a blunder; for success provoked the Jews' quarrelsomeness. A Jew was killed in one of the free fights which continually occurred between the Samaritans and the pilgrims on their way to the festivals. The affray taking place at the last halting-place near Ginæa, the murdered man probably had gone too far, trusting in the proximity of the border, and had fallen a victim to his imprudence.[1] The man was a Galilean; his pugnacious countrymen instantly gathered together to punish the Samaritans. Upon Cumanus' refusing to comply at once with the elders' demand for another example, the multitudes who had gathered for the feast rushed to arms and hurried *en masse* to the Samaritan frontier.[2]

But though the officials now instituted a strict inquiry and punishment of all offenders, a famous leader of banditti, Eleazar, son of Dinæus, had already put himself at the head of the insurrection, and fired the villages of Acrabatene, south of Sichem. According to Josephus, Cumanus had already suppressed the rising with the whole strength of the Roman forces. Tacitus, who perhaps had access to the records relating to the recal of the procurator, gives a very different account of the facts. At

[1] Bell. ii. 12, 3, gives one man killed; Ant. xx. 6, 1, several.

[2] Here, again, Bell. ii. 12, 3, differs from Ant. xx. 6, 1.

a previous change of governors, Pallas had made Samaria a separate district, and put it under his brother Felix as procurator.[1] It was the first example of a freedman being entrusted with the supreme administration of a province, and consequently with the exercise of sovereign rights. Cumanus not being the man to curb the Jews, Felix took up the cudgels for his Samaritans, helping them to organize their banditti, to draw the incendiaries into ambuscades, and bring on pitched battles. The province had even to endure the scandal of seeing Roman soldiers fighting with Romans, for there still remained at Samaria those native troops who were to have been sent to Pontus on account of their excesses at the death of Herod Agrippa I., but had been left to annoy the Jews, and had done their best to irritate them on every opportunity.[2] Felix let them continue to do so; and he himself, as well as Cumanus, was accused of taking his share of the booty captured in every part of the country.[3] At this point, Quadratus, proconsul of Syria, took cognizance of the situation, and sent a report to Rome. Now at last Cumanus appears to have set bounds to his indulgence to the Jews, leading his united forces against Jerusalem, and threatening to plunder the city, sell the inhabitants, and burn the temple to the ground. The threat was sufficient. The leaders ordered their banditti to disperse, and Eleazar and his irregulars retreated to the caves.

But while tranquillity settled upon the former scene of war, and the Samaritans began with lamentations to clear away the débris of their huts, public insecurity increased in numberless places, and silent preparation was made for a general insurrection. Meanwhile Quadratus received orders from the court to stamp out the disturbance, and deal with the procurators as he thought fit. On entering Tyre, he was met by the elders of the Samaritans and the Jewish chief-priests, led by the high-priest Ananias Nebedai, and Jonathan, son of Annas, each party with the gravest charges against one another and against Cumanus. Quadratus appointed them to meet him at Samaria, in order to

[1] Cf. above, Vol. ii. p. 180. [2] Ant. xix. 9, 2. [3] Tac. Ann. xii. 54.

investigate matters on the spot. But on perceiving that the Jews in the neighbourhood were preparing a rebellion without any pretence at concealment, he took the preliminary step of crucifying all the prisoners taken by Cumanus. Jonathan, Ananias Nebedai, and Annas, with some other chief-priests, who had spoken out too boldly, were flung into chains and sent to Rome. One of the chief agitators, Dortai, and three of his comrades, perished on the scaffold at Lydda as an example to the people.

Tranquillity followed. The insurrectionary temper gave way to spiritless depression. When, at the Passover of 51, Ummidius Quadratus established himself in Jerusalem, he was convinced that the populace had abandoned their schemes, and returned calmly to Antioch. Yet for all his severity against the Jewish insurgents, his mandate to call the procurators to account remained unfulfilled. He felt no disposition to embroil himself with the brother of Pallas. He preferred to shield him from every complaint, by making him his assessor in the court before which the guilty were tried. As to Cumanus and the tribune Celer, on the other hand, who were accused by Jews and Samaritans alike, he sent them, along with the other prisoners of either faction, to be dealt with by the imperial court. The son of Agrippa I., who at this juncture was in Rome, made every effort to save the leaders of his people. The ministers were inclined to shield Cumanus, and punish the Jews and Samaritans as rioters; but young Herod Agrippa succeeded in interesting Agrippina in the case. So the judgment finally pronounced was that Cumanus should be exiled, because he had failed to act with vigour at the right moment. Three of the Samaritans were executed, and the tribune Celer sent to Jerusalem for the Jews to torture and drag through the city, and execute on the spot, wherever it might be, where he had wronged them or their law. Ananias Nebedai was restored to the high-priesthood, and the vacant procuratorship given to Claudius, the brother of Pallas.

Such were the events which ended in 52 with CLAUDIUS FELIX

assuming the government of the country against which he had sinned so deeply, the young Agrippa being given Chalcis next year in satisfaction. The situation was unchanged at the death of Claudius; and Pallas, being able to maintain himself for two years more after the assassination of his prince, Claudius Felix also remained in possession of his precarious power. The picture drawn of their own official by the Romans is far from reassuring. Tacitus calls him "a freedman who exercised the royal power in the spirit of a slave." But the magnitude of the social change effected in the empire by the influence of Cæsarism is shown by the fact that the slave, the brother of the powerful minister, married three queens in succession.[1] One was the granddaughter of Cleopatra and Antony, so that the "slave" was actually connected with the imperial house. In Palestine, his intercourse with the neighbouring allies made him acquainted with Drusilla, the youngest daughter of Herod Agrippa, and wife of king Aziz of Emesa. The charms of the fair Jewess fired the inflammable heart of the now elderly courtier. At this juncture, Josephus tells of one Magus Simon at Samaria, who aided Felix in carrying off the queen. The Cabbalist found easy admittance to the court of Emesa. The queen's enmity against her sister Bernice further contributed to put her into the power of the sorcerer, for she would be decidedly the most powerful of her family as the sister-in-law of Pallas. So she fled from her husband, who had turned Jew for her sake, and married the brother of the great minister. As wife of the procurator, the daughter of Herod Agrippa went to live in the old Herod's palace at Cæsarea, the scene of her father's sudden death.

Yet perhaps this marriage was not only due to the lust of the eye. It seems to bear the mark of the calculating politician as well as the practised libertine. By connecting himself with the Herods, Felix secured his position as governor of Judæa; at the same time, since the marriage took place before the extension of his procuratorship over all Judæa, his advancement may partly

[1] Tac. Hist. v. 9; Suet. Claud. 28: trium reginarum maritum.

be due to the fact of his marriage. Indeed, he was inclined to hint at this title to his high position by consulting his wife on questions of Jewish ritual.[1] Nevertheless, though he became through Drusilla brother-in-law of Agrippa, whom Nero appointed king of the upper country and guardian of the temple, it was in their *entourage* that his opponents were to be found. His brother-in-law was the secret rival of his power.

The son of Herod Agrippa could not but wish the Roman procuratorship to be abolished once more as soon as possible. He was seventeen when his father died, and Pallas defrauded him of the patrimony of the Herods. Since then, Agrippa the younger had never ceased demanding his rights. The emperor Claudius was favourably disposed towards him; he adopted the young Jew into the Julian *gens*,[2] made him his own ward, and took some credit for personally training the son of the man who saved his life.[3] Had it rested with him, Agrippa would have come to the throne; but the freedmen managed to satisfy the emperor's sense of what was fitting by sundry trifling concessions to the memory of the dead king, and the young prince was put off. In the year 48, he at last succeeded to Herod of Chalcis, whose son Aristobulus was transferred to the vacant throne of the Lebanon. There his sister Bernice, the widow of the late prince, held court, while he paid his frequent visits to Rome, or transacted the business of the temple at Jerusalem.

The third of the trio of sisters was BERNICE, Agrippa's sister and mistress. Cæsarism had familiarized the world with such relationships. Caligula had had his sister Drusilla as his mistress; Claudius lived with his niece Agrippina, who for her part did not shrink from similar relations with her own son. Our emancipated Jews would not fall short of their Roman models even in this respect. Famous for her dazzling beauty, this

[1] Acts xxiv. 22, seq.

[2] Le Bas et Waddington, Inscr. Gr. et L., Tome iii. No. 2365.

[3] Ant. xx. 1, 2; cf. xix. 9, 2.

princess, like her sisters, had such a reputation, as early as her father's death, that the Samaritan soldiery introduced her busts into houses of ill-fame, placing them on the platform usually occupied by courtezans.[1]

At that time, after a brief betrothal to a nephew of Philo, she was married to her father's elder brother, Herod of Chalcis, to whom she bore two sons, Bernicianus and Hyrcanus. At the death of her elderly husband, she was twenty-one years of age and in the zenith of her beauty. Her brother inherited her along with the crown, and kept her at his court. Before long they were dogged by a most persistent rumour; brother and sister, it was said, were living in forbidden relations. Their diamonds were afterwards sold by the jewellers of Rome as piquant love-tokens:

> "— the famous diamond, whose worth
> Grew on Bernice's finger; long ago
> Agrippa gave it to the incestuous queen,
> Barbarian, to his sister, in the land
> Where barefoot kings the sabbath celebrate,
> And the fat hog finds mercy from of old."[2]

The scandal growing too great, Bernice consented to marry Polemon, king of Pontus, who coveted her wealth rather than herself. He had to undergo circumcision before she would marry a Gentile. Soon, however, she left him again, "from sheer fickleness, as was said," and returned to her brother, exposing herself to shameful slander.[3] Henceforth she was the moving spirit of the Herods' family politics, maintaining the traditions of the house abroad as well as at home, for she is celebrated in an Athenian inscription as a benefactress of that city.[4] True that in Josephus' ornate account she savours of a stage-princess; still she was a remarkable woman, with undeniable power even over men of intellectual eminence.

In the year 53, Agrippa exchanged the scanty territories of Chalcis for the more important principalities of Philip and

[1] Ant. xix. 9, 1; Juv. Sat. iii. 136.
[2] Juv. vi. 155—160.
[3] Ant. xx. 7.
[4] Corp. Inscr. Gr. 361.

Lysanias, together with Abila;[1] to which Nero immediately added the Galilean districts of Tiberias and Tarichæa, Scythopolis and Julias in Peræa, with fourteen villages.[2] It has been seen already how the Parthian war furthered the ambition of the Herods. Seneca and Burrus recognized in them the fittest dynasties for the establishment of vassal kingdoms. Tigranes, Agrippa's cousin, was recognized as king of Armenia, and Bernice's stepson Aristobulus as king of Lesser Armenia. Bernice herself was also provided with a domain in Galilee.[3] Brother and sister managed to express their gratitude. Agrippa changed the name of his capital from Cæsarea Philippi to Neronias; he erected a theatre at Berytus, and had Greek plays performed there every year on Nero's birthday. Nor was this all; the provinces allotted to him showed further traces of his readiness to bring Gentile customs into the land of the Jews. Statues and pictures were erected at Cæsarea Philippi as well as Tiberias, while all manner of Pharisaic proceedings were designed to win over the people of Jerusalem to his objects. Like his mother Cypros, he is to be seen on his visits to Tiberias consulting the Rabbis as to the best mode of attending the feast of Tabernacles and regulating his court; he begged them to resolve his religious doubts, how it was that God had not included circumcision among the Ten Commandments, if it was the most important of the divine ordinances?[4] The duplicity of the true Herod is to be seen in many inscriptions, where he calls himself Marcus Julius Agrippa, the friend of Cæsar, the Pious, the friend of the Romans.[5] But he was soon to learn that in Judæa it was impossible to be at once pious and the friend of the Romans. The Zealots hated him and his Gentile abominations as fervently as his accursed grandfather, while the whole country suffered heavily

[1] Jos. Bell. ii. 12, 8; 13, 2; 18, 6; Ant. xx. 7, 1; Vita, 11.

[2] Bell. ii. 13, 2; Ant. xx. 8, 4; Tac. Ann. xiii. 7.

[3] Jos. Vita, 24, 65; cf. Keim, Herod's sons, Bib. Lex. iii. 58.

[4] Derenbourg, p. 252.

[5] Waddington, op. cit. 2112, 2365, 2413, 2552.

from his excessive zeal to be of use in the never-ending Parthian war, in which he was generally employed with his followers as an advance-guard.[1] The consequence was that, to his great astonishment, the rebellious Jews turned against himself, who was intending to liberate Israel by his petty arts.

The situation under Felix in Jerusalem, the seat of the apostles, was even more gloomy than in the home of Jesus. The position of the procurator was absolutely insecure, because it was obtained by the gracious silence of his subjects upon his former misdeeds. He himself had been concerned in the late disturbance as the leader of the Samaritans, and his appointment was the signal for the bands of Zealots to renew their guerilla warfare. The "believers" also, i.e. the Messianic prophets, again began to play a prominent part.

Perceiving himself unready to cope with the banditti, he invited their leader Eleazar, son of Dinæus, with the chief men of his band, to a conference at his court, under promise of safe-conduct. The high-souled Maccabæan from the hills of Judah trusted the Roman slave and came in. Felix instantly seized him and all his followers, and sent them to Rome. Such a victory naturally gained him nothing in the eyes of his subjects. Ananias Nebedai, Jonathan the late high-priest,[2] and the other sons of Annas, to whose silence at the inquiry in Rome he owed his purple, were never weary of recalling their services and threatening complaints. His increasing difficulties led the procurator to negociate with certain citizens of Jerusalem to see if it were possible to hand over Jonathan to the Zealots, a far more inconvenient keeper of his conscience than Ananias Nebedai, who was sunk in sensuality. With the help of one Doran of Jerusalem, he actually succeeded in getting bandits to make away with the highminded priest in the very precincts of the city. The assassins slipped in among Jonathan's retinue as he went to the temple, and then struck him down. As the pro-

[1] Tac. Ann. xv. 9, 25.

[2] Ant. xviii. 4, 3; 5, 3; xix. 6, 4; Bell. ii. 12, 5, 6; 13, 3; Ant. xx. 8, 5.

curator shrank from an inquiry, there was a repetition of his lesson to the Jews. The fanatics came up openly to the city at the feasts, mingled with the crowd, dagger in hand, pressed up to the destined victim, Roman or Sadducee—nay, even among the Pharisees—and struck him down.

Among others, it was determined to get rid of Paul in this way at Pentecost, 59.[1] Accidents multiplied to such an extent that friend mistrusted friend. Any one pressing too near another, passed for a Sicarius, a dagger-man.[2] "At the same time," continues Josephus, "occurred another outbreak of the wicked, whose hands were cleaner, but whose temper was more ruthless than the Sicarii, and who contributed not less than the latter to the misfortunes of the city. They were seducers and deceivers, who, under the show of divine inspiration, aimed at revolution and tumult, and led the people to wild frenzy, so that they followed them out into the wilderness, in order to see the miraculous signs of their liberation which God would show them. Felix perceived in this the germs of riot, and sent armed foot and horse against them, who slew a great multitude."

Now among all the Messianic prophets of this time, none had a greater influence on his contemporaries than an Egyptian Jew, who marched straight upon Jerusalem with his hosts, in order to pull down the walls of the city which had become so un-Jewish. It looks as though there were a certain connection between the ideas of the several prophets. The prophet of Gerizim appeared as a second Moses, promising the people the hidden vessels of the ark of the covenant. Others proposed wanderings in the wilderness; Theudas meant to lead the faithful dry-shod across Jordan as a second Joshua. Now when the Passover of 59 approached, the Egyptian set himself to repeat Joshua's miracle at Jericho. The banditti flocked to him in great numbers; the Acts speaks of 4000 Sicarii, Josephus even

[1] Ant. xx. 8, 6, seq.; Acts xxiii. 14. The writer of the Acts would then seem to have borrowed this feature intentionally from Ant. xx. 8, 6.

[2] Bell. ii. 13, 3.

of 30,000. His probable design was to start a great popular rebellion, and at the same time to make himself master of the temple. To this end, he placed the appearance of the sign of liberation close to the temple, on the Mount of Olives. He promised that at his word the walls of Jerusalem would fall down. This undertaking, like the rest, would only repeat the experiences of their forefathers. When Joshua was at Jericho, he lifted up his eyes, and before him stood a man with a drawn sword. It was the captain of the host of heaven, sent to aid the chosen people. And Joshua heard the voice of Jehovah: "I have given into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valour. And ye shall compass the city, all the men of war, going about the city once. And it shall be that when they make a long blast with the ram's horn, and when ye hear the sound of the trumpet, all the people shall shout with a great shout; and the wall of the city shall fall down flat, and the people shall go up every man straight before him."[1]

Similar expectations were now roused by the prophet. According to Josephus, he hoped to force his way into Jerusalem amid the press of the multitudes and the on-lookers, to overthrow the Roman garrison, seize the sovereignty of Israel, and distribute the seats of the new kingdom to his satellites.[2] But the Mount of Olives saw the wreck of the Messianic dream for the second time. Felix received timely warning, occupied the valley of the Kidron, and though the people made a desparate resistance to his heavy armed soldiers, their ill-equipped bands were scattered in every direction. Four hundred fell; two hundred met their fate as prisoners. The Egyptian himself vanished with the supporters of his kingdom; the rest got away and sought to hide in their homes.

Tranquillity was far from being restored. The scattered prophets got up new tumults here and there, declaring war on all and sundry who made concessions to the Gentile. Their banditti spread over the whole country, plundering the estates of the

[1] Josh. v. 13, vi. 21. [2] So Bell. ii. 13, 5.

wealthy, murdering tax-gatherers and friends of Rome, and burning entire villages.

To complete the chaos, this was the moment at which the furious factions among the priests broke out in Jerusalem.[1] After the death of the first Agrippa, the high-priesthood had again become the sport of the Sadducean families; and Agrippa II., who now had the honour at his disposal, vacillated between one party and another. He advanced the families of Boethus and Annas; but the spiritual princes they gave the country were stubborn and arbitrary, and not unfrequently treated their Levites as a body-guard to fight street-fights in Jerusalem, to the great scandal of the nation. The provocation lay in the usurpations of the upper classes of priests, who declared that they alone had a claim on the tithes, and sent to the threshing-floors in the most high-handed manner to remove the corn belonging to the lower class of priests. They boldly demanded a larger share in the revenues of the temple, and set their own force against the force of the sons of Annas. Even the citizens were distracted by factions. Every day there were affrays and fights with cudgels and stones. At last the notables crushed all opposition, and left the Levites to hunger, always the strongest stimulus to revolution.

The life and soul of these wild doings was, next to the brutal sons of Annas, Ananias, son of Nebedæus. Appointed by Herod of Chalcis,[2] he had been sent to Rome by Quadratus for his share in the war against the Samaritans, but had been saved by the good offices of Felix and Agrippa.[3] Felix hated him and Jonathan, because they had seen him in his weakness; but Agrippa II. having influence in this matter, the procurator failed to get rid of him.[4] He is Paul's notorious judge, who treated the Apostle with the same brutality with which he

[1] Ant. xx. 8—10.

[2] Ant. xx. 5, 2; cf. Schürer, Die ἀρχιερεῖς im Neuen Test. Stud. u. Crit., 1872, Part iv.

[3] Ant. xx. 6, 2; Bell. ii. 12, 6.

[4] Ant. x. 8, 5.

treated the lower classes of priests.[1] At Paul's trial he appears with a retinue of coarse temple-servants, whom he bids smite the accused on the mouth when he attempts to defend himself. In the same way he enforces his claim upon the tithes of corn, even after his deposition, by means of armed servants and banditti. Any one who said him nay was in the same manner struck on the mouth.[2] Just as he has dealings with the Sicarii when Paul seems to escape, so again in his later transactions he appears as an intermediary between the procurator and the gangs who seize his friends to exchange them for prisoners of their party. At the same time, money played a great part in his proceedings, and was not spared either in the case of Felix.[3]

By these means he maintained his position till the time of the Jewish war, to the outbreak of which his high-handed behaviour in the capital greatly contributed. But with the insurrection his hour struck. Well aware of the hatred against him, he hid himself in the sewer, whence he was dragged as the first victim to popular indignation.[4] The type of cruelty and high-handedness in Josephus and the Acts, he is notorious in the Talmud for gluttony and greed.[5] The authorities of the Talmud, indeed, have preserved a series of characteristic stories which are a bitter indictment of the degeneration of the latter-day priesthood. Thus a contemporary, Abba Joseph ben Honein of Jerusalem, is reported to have exclaimed, on seeing the mismanagement of the temple:

> "Woe is me for the generation of Boethus,
> Woe is me for his spear.
> Woe is me for the generation of Annas,
> Woe is me for their serpent's hiss.
> Woe is me for the family of Cantheras,
> Woe is me for their pen.

[1] Acts xxiii. 2, seq., xxiv. 1.

[2] Ant. xx. 9, 2: *τοὺς μὴ διδόντας οὐκ ἀπείχοντο τύπτειν.* Here, again, it must be noticed that Josephus' account is known to the writer of the Acts.

[3] Ant. xx. 9, 2; Acts xxiv. 26.

[4] Bell. ii. 17; 6, 9.

[5] Derenbourg, Pal. 234.

Woe is me for the family of Israel ben Phami,
Woe is me for their hand.
They are high-priests; their sons are keepers of the treasure, their sons-in-law overseers of the temple,
And their servants smite the people with staves."[1]

Proceeding to tell how, shortly before the outbreak of the war, the mysterious cry of "Let us go hence"[2] was heard in the temple, Josephus is fully informed as to the person and the crime that provoked Jehovah to depart from his desecrated temple. "Four times," he says, "rang out the cry, Out, ye sons of Eli: ye defile the temple of the Eternal. Out, Issachar,[3] thou who dost maintain thine honours and desecrate the sacrifices sanctified to the Lord. Open wide the doors; let in Ishmael ben Phabi, the disciple of Phinehas! Open wide the doors; let in Ananias Nebedai, the son of gluttony, that he may slay himself victims!"[4]

Thus the little country offered a scene of utter disorganization. The Roman government was powerless, the bond of the hierarchy broken, the Pharisees' schools of the Zealots silenced, Jerusalem itself distracted by civil strife. Such was the situation at Easter, 59, when Paul came up from Corinth with the charitable gifts of the Christian Dispersion to allay the crying distress of the poorer brethren in Jerusalem.

---

3. Paul in Judæa.

The situation of the little Christian church at Jerusalem can only be imagined as most precarious under the existing state of

[1] Pesachim, 57, in Derenb. Pal. 232. [2] Bell. vi. 5, 3.

[3] The same who had his hand cut off by Agrippa because he sacrificed in gloves. Derenb. 212.

[4] Derenb. Pal. 233, 234. It is not clear whether Ishmael ben Phabi, characterized above as high-handed, is only ironically compared to Phinehas, the zealot against unchastity, or used, like the Boethusi, to act with the spear of Phinehas. In any case, both he and Ananias were notorious for high-handed action.

affairs in Judæa. Twenty-four years had passed since the Galilean followers of Jesus had migrated to Jerusalem, where they awaited the advent of the Master. The gospel had found a response. Not only the Phœnician coast, but Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece and Italy, were covered with churches which avowed Jesus as Messiah. But in Jerusalem itself the situation of the Christians had grown more and more difficult. True that they were at one with the great majority of the people in believing that the signs of the last judgment would be manifested immediately. But they must have been deeply pained when the multitude were drawn hither and thither after false prophets to see the dawn of the great day. They were well assured that none knew the time and the hour save the Father, and that the Son of Man would come unexpectedly like a thief in the night. Nevertheless, the Christians were more than ever intent upon the nearness of the kingdom. So vivid a picture of the advent and meaning of this kingdom as is unfolded by the Apocalypse, is in its nature no mere phantasy of an individual; by its diligent searching of the Scriptures, the whole church had contributed the stones of which the writer erected his marvellous structure.

Thus in general and in particular, in their conception of the time and of their duties, the Christians of Judæa were again at one with their nation, and their leaders were indeed respected by the Pharisees.[1] Still their position, like that of the majority of the poor, could not fail to be one of great distress in this time of disquiet and ruined trade. But this was the point at which their connection with the foreign churches came in. The idea of such relief for the saints as was collected by the Jews of the Dispersion, came home to the foreign churches with the greater force because the Christians of Jerusalem had simply stayed in the holy city through their common hope that Jesus would re-appear on Zion to establish the kingdom.

With this view, Paul made ready in the beginning of 59 to

[1] Ant. xx. 9, 1.

bring the famishing brethren at Jerusalem a considerable sum which he had collected in Galatia, Asia, Macedonia and Achaia. But he realized the danger of his undertaking even when preparing to take ship from Corinth to Jerusalem at the Passover of 59. The Jews—that is to say, those who came to Cenchreæ with the same purpose of going up to the feast—resolved not to let the schismatic reach the holy city alive. Paul was forced to renounce his plan for the present, and returned to Macedonia.[1]

It was perhaps a misfortune that he did not get to Jerusalem at the Passover, for the Apostle of Jesus might very possibly have escaped the notice of the multitude in the excitement evoked by the Egyptian and the vast overthrow he planned. As it was, he only took ship after the festival was over, and repeatedly broke his journey, avoiding vessels which sailed direct and carried the pilgrims, in order to escape the plots of which he had wind. The companion of the Apostle, who in the Acts has already spoken in his own person of the first journey from Troas to Philippi and the sojourn in the latter city, re-appears in Acts xx. 6, and tells, as from his own experience, of the voyage from Philippi to Troas, and the parting from the brethren of Troas:

"And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days: where we tarried seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow; and prolonged his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where we were gathered together. And there sat in the window a certain young man named Eutychus, borne down with deep sleep; and as Paul discoursed yet longer, being borne down by his sleep he fell down from the third story, and was taken up dead. And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing him said, Make ye no ado; for his life is in him. And when he was gone up, and had broken the bread, and eaten,

[1] Acts xx. 3.

and had talked with them a long while, even till break of day, so he departed. And they brought the lad alive, and were not a little comforted."

Even now the little company thought best to separate. Luke, Timothy, Aristarchus, Tychicus, Trophimus and the rest, sailed along the coast, while Paul, who had worked in this neighbourhood the previous summer, took the land route to Assos through the mountains.[1] They expected to reach the place at noon on the second day. It lay on a height, strongly fortified. The harbour was reached by a steep and precipitous way, of which the poet Stratonicus sang:

"Wilt hurry to thy death? Seek Assos, then."

The harbour was formed by a long mole.[2] Here Paul met his friends, who took him on board again, and so they coasted along to Mitylene. On the following day, running out of the harbour always filled with ships, they came to Chios. Next day they touched at Samos, and at nightfall stopped at Cape Trogyllium. Ephesus the Apostle did not venture to visit. He was prevented by the occurrences of the previous year leading to his expulsion, and by the desire to keep his journey secret. Nevertheless, he arranged to meet a deputation from the Ephesian brethren at Miletus, when the writer of the Acts takes occasion to introduce one of his speeches, resuming in the first person at xxi. 1. Passing the islands of Cos and Rhodes, they reached Patara. Here they found a ship going to Tyre. This was the end of coasting. They struck out into the open sea. Before long the peaks of the Cyprian Olympus rose before them, towering over the vine-clad terraces of the island which Paul and Barnabas had first traversed ten years before. This time they passed by the island, the ship making straight for Tyre, where it discharged its cargo. Here they waited awhile till they found out the church of the brethren. All were terrified to hear Paul's design of going up to Jerusalem at Pentecost; but Paul refused to stay, and took the first ship to carry him and his companions to Ptolemais.

[1] Acts xx. 4. [2] Strabo, xiii. 581.

After a short rest, the company made ready to go on foot through the plain of Sharon, then bright with all the glories of spring, up to Cæsarea. In this modern and populous city they made for the house of the aged Philip, one of the seven chosen in the third decade to minister to the poor at the beginning of the scarcity. He had afterwards gone to live in Cæsarea. His house was a centre for a number of the old disciples who had known Jesus. Here these travellers might feel themselves on entirely new ground; the nearness of Jerusalem was to be felt in the universal excitement. Philip himself had four daughters who prophesied. We find here also one of those prophets who were so objectionable to Josephus. It was the aged Agabus, who had come from Jerusalem, and was known to Paul from his first sojourn at Antioch.[1] Hearing that Paul meant to go up to Jerusalem, he took off his girdle, bound his own hands and feet together, and said: "Thus saith the Holy Ghost: So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles." In the city itself the most exciting events had just taken place; all was full of talk about the uproar at the late feast, the leader of which, the Egyptian, was expected to re-appear. The assassins, too, were in full activity.

But Paul was resolved on going, however dear it might cost him. It was as if the words of Jesus, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem," were ringing in his ears, so clear did the future lie before him. His friends were the more urgent that he should not choose this moment to show himself to the people. The eye-witness who wrote the Travel-document says as follows: "Then Paul answered, What do ye, weeping and breaking my heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done. And after these days we took up our baggage, and went up to Jerusalem. And there went with us also certain of

[1] Acts xi. 28.

the disciples from Cæsarea, bringing with them one Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple, with whom we should lodge." This last precaution was very necessary. The city and its environs were usually so overflowing at the feast that it was difficult to find shelter. At the same time, the circumstances were such that Paul could not trust the first-comer, while common prudence forbade him to lodge with his relations, where he would have been looked for first.

It was not the first time Paul had come face to face with the Christians of Jerusalem; but although the quarrel between him and them had burned more fiercely than ever since their last meeting, he had never ceased to think of their necessities, and was now coming to help them. Still, things seem not to have gone as smoothly as the Acts, in which the account of the eye-witness here comes to an end, would persuade itself and its readers. It was part of the legend of Simon, and so, perhaps, of the Jewish Christians' account of this meeting, that when the Magus, i.e. Paul, offered Peter money in return for imparting to him the power of the Spirit, Peter replied: "Thy silver perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right before God. Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray the Lord, if perhaps the thought of thy heart shall be forgiven thee. For I see that thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity."[1] Considering, now, that the legend of Simon has borrowed obvious traits from the life of the Apostle Paul, and that under this name the Judaists cast aspersions on the memory of Paul, the belief seems to have existed in these strongly Judaistic circles that Paul and his gift of money were rudely repulsed by Peter and James. There is, further, a supplementary reference to talk of some such repulse in Rom. xv. 30—32, a passage the genuineness of which has been disputed on cogent grounds. Moreover, Paul's own remarks from prison in Cæsarea would imply previous con-

[1] Acts viii. 20.

flicts. "Of the circumcision, Mark and Jesus, which is called Justus," he writes in the Epistle to the Colossians, "these only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, men that have been a comfort unto me."[1]

What, however, more than anything else supports the assumption that a personal breach took place on this occasion, is the manner in which the Acts speaks of the proceedings at Jerusalem. However eagerly it seeks to veil the deep antagonism between parties, even the Acts is unable to conceal the dislike of the Christians in Jerusalem to Paul's presence amongst them. "Thou seest, brother," the apostles are represented as saying to Paul, "how many thousands there are among the Jews of them which have believed; and they are all zealous for the law: and they have been informed concerning thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." The fact, then, that the church of Jerusalem was dominated by dislike of Paul's work, is not unknown to the Acts; but the attempt to overcome the repugnance of the Judaists and change their mind, as related of Paul, is scarcely credible. Paul is made to promise the apostles that he would give the lie to the calumny that he preached the abandonment of the Mosaic law, by undertaking the cost of a Nazirite vow for four Jewish Christians, that all might know there was no truth in this aspersion, but "that he himself also walked orderly, keeping the law."

Such an assertion Paul could not make without falsehood. And indeed for the writer of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians to stand seven days in the forecourt of the temple, oil-cake in hand, to go through all the minutiæ with which Rabbinical ingenuity had hedged about this vow, to have submitted to all the liturgical pedantries of ritual as then established at the hands of unbelieving Levites and priests, and finally to offer on behalf of himself and his four companions a burnt-

[1] Col. iv. 11.

offering of five lambs, a sin-offering of five ewes, a thank-offering of five rams and five baskets of unleavened bread and cakes, together with the necessary meat-offering and drink-offering, winding up with casting his hair into the blazing fire on the altar,—all this is about as likely as that Luther in his old age should have made a pilgrimage on peas to a hermitage, or that Calvin on his death-bed vowed a golden coat to the Holy Mother of God. Nor do the traces to be met with elsewhere point to an understanding being arrived at between Paul and the Jewish Christians, the fanatics amongst whom were naturally in the majority on a feast-day.

One thing at least is certain; they troubled little about Paul when he was cast into his Roman prison. According to the Acts, seven days had passed before the dreaded catastrophe occurred. Some Jews from Ephesus, who were so well acquainted with the Apostle and the origin of his followers that they themselves were taken for Jewish Christians, saw him in the forecourt of the Israelites, which was separated from the forecourt of the Gentiles by the barrier, as it was called, and at the entrance of which a notice was posted forbidding Gentiles, on pain of death, to go beyond the barrier.[1] Now these pious men had seen Paul the day before in the city with the Ephesian Trophimus, which gave rise to the cry that this notorious Paul had introduced an uncircumcised man into the inner temple. The news spread swiftly over the whole of Jerusalem; the people, who may have long been expecting a new opportunity for rioting, rushed in crowds to the temple. Paul was just being dragged through the gate, which the high-priest, Ananias Nebedai, immediately ordered to be shut. Fortunately, precautions had been taken in the citadel of Antonia against any such event. The tribune, Claudius Lysias, who had been ordered up to Jerusalem for the feast, rushed down the instant he perceived the tumult, to rescue the victim. On seeing the Roman

[1] For the recovery of one of these notices, cf. the Quarterly Statement of Palestine Explor. Fund, 1871, p. 132, seq.

troops, the populace desisted from beating Paul. The latter was instantly arrested: but all that the tribune could make out from the confused shouts of the multitude was, that he had before him a seducer of the people and false prophet. It flashed across him that he had caught the Egyptian who had recently inspired the great march to the Mount of Olives. He bade secure Paul with two chains: then, as the people pressed upon him with increasing fury, it became necessary for the soldiers to remove him beyond reach of farther outrage. When the gates of Antonia closed behind him, the tribune asked: "Art thou not, then, the Egyptian, which before these days stirred up to sedition and led out into the wilderness the four thousand men of the assassins?" Paul replied: "I am a Jew of Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city; and I beseech thee, give me leave to speak unto the people." The tribune was willing; Paul therefore advanced to the stairs of the citadel, and pleaded his cause before the people in the Hebrew tongue.

According to the Acts, the people let him speak without interruption till, in the course of the story of his life, he reached the missions to the Gentiles. This was the signal for a violent outburst: the people cried out, threw off their garments, and cast dust into the air. The tribune was amazed; he drew Paul in, and ordered him to be scourged, in order that he might at last learn what cause the people had against him. Already tied up to receive the lash, Paul cried, "Is it lawful to scourge a man that is a Roman?" His appeal was effectual. He was unbound, but had to pass the night in Antonia. Next day the tribune thought he had grasped the situation, and now ordered the Sanhedrin to be convened, for Caligula had restored its jurisdiction in religious questions.[1] At the appointed hour, Claudius Lysias came in person to the synagogue of the temple with his prisoner; the high-priest, too, with his ill-famed followers, the cruel and aggressive son of Nebedai, who at this time went with his temple-servants from one priestly residence to

[1] Ant. xviii. 5, 3.

another.[1] Paul spoke first, and said: "Brethren, I have lived before God in all good conscience until this day." On this, Ananias commanded those who stood near him to smite him on the mouth. "Thou whited wall," Paul rejoined; "and sittest thou there to judge me according to the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" But reminded by the indignation of the Jews that it was the high-priest he was reviling, he corrected himself with the appropriate quotation, "Thou shalt not speak evil of a ruler of thy people."[2]

In the course of the examination, he was able to point out how little reason this assembly, consisting for the most part of Pharisees, had to call him to account for views which were shared on essential points by its members. They taught the resurrection of the dead; so did he. They taught the approaching advent of the kingdom of God; so did he. They taught that the Messiah must first come; so did he. They taught that God had intercourse with men by means of angels, dreams and visions; so did he. The Pharisees shared the very doctrines which made him a schismatic in the eyes of the Sadducees.

There followed a strange revelation of the deep-seated rift within the supreme assembly. So hot was the quarrel on either side that the tribune called in the guard to remove Paul. All he could make out was, that he had to deal with a very disputable offence. But now that the fanatics of the recent outbreak were driven to fear they would be cheated of their latest victim, forty assassins took a vow neither to eat nor to drink until they had slain Paul. Far from affecting any concealment, they expressly required the high-priest to invite Paul again to the synagogue of the temple, in order to give an opportunity for dealing the murderous blow. Josephus gives other instances of

[1] Ant. xx. 9, 2. Here, of course, the Acts in part reproduces the colouring of Josephus, whom the writer had before him; on the other hand, since it also makes use of descriptions from the account of the journey, it is difficult to distinguish what is owed to Josephus and what to Luke.

[2] Exod. xxii. 27.

communications between Ananias and the assassins.[1] On this occasion the design, which was talked of openly, came to the ears of Paul's relations. They sent his sister's son to the citadel to warn him. At Paul's request, the centurion on guard took the lad to Claudius Lysias, who gave him a hearing, and took prompt measures. He ordered seventy horsemen and two hundred spearmen to be ready at evening. If the numbers are correct, a desperate attack was expected, or there were other prisoners to conduct. At nightfall, they set Paul on a horse, and took him in silence along the road to Antipatris. Next morning, the foot-soldiers returned to Jerusalem; the mounted squadron accompanied Paul to Cæsarea, where their officer in command gave the tribune's written report to the procurator.

Claudius Antonius Felix asked the prisoner who he was and whence he came, and then confined him in the palace of Herod, at that time used as the prætorium; but allowed his companion, Aristarchus of Macedon, to stay with him.[2] It was to be anticipated that the energetic Ananias would not abandon the cause of the Sanhedrin without further effort. Five days later, he appeared in Cæsarea to prosecute the case against Paul. This time he brought with him, not only the temple-servants, but a Greek orator and pleader, Tertullus, better acquainted than himself with the language and forms of a Roman court, in order to secure the punishment of Paul for schism and desecration of the temple, in accordance with the current law of aliens. When Paul denied the facts complained of, and explained that in general and in particular he maintained Judaism according to the law and the prophets, Felix postponed the matter till Lysias' return from Jerusalem. Meanwhile, the offence did not seem enough to justify severer measures against the prisoner. He was admitted to *custodia libera;* his chains were struck off, and intercourse with friends and relations permitted.

Paul might think himself fortunate in quitting the gloom of Jerusalem, that den of fanaticism and assassination, for the

[1] Ant. xx. 9, 3. [2] Col. iv. 10.

bright and cheerful city of Cæsarea. Of all the cities of Palestine, this was the most Greek. The seat of Roman government, Cæsarea was a city of officials and Gentiles. It was not until the final outburst of Jewish patriotism that Israel attempted to re-capture this stronghold from the Gentiles. Paul's place of confinement was the ancient palace of Herod, now the residence of the procurator and his wife Drusilla. Dark memories clung about the old buildings. This was where Herod pronounced sentence of death on his sons. This was where their betrayer Antipater was arrested. Five days and five nights the Jews lay wailing before the gates, beseeching Pilate not to desecrate the temple. Here Herod Agrippa breathed out his hypocritical soul, while the multitude shrieked and wept and knelt in the dust beneath his windows, praying for the life of their pious king. It was the centre of historical scenes without number; not a stone but kept the stain of blood on it from the times of Herod. At this time, too, the state of the country had crowded its walls with prisoners, who were grouped according to their offences and kept under more or less strict surveillance. Among others, the historian Josephus, then twenty-six years of age and a zealous Pharisee, visited prisoners here. The men he came to see were priests of the most rigid sect of the Pharisees, who rejected the unclean prison-fare and lived on figs and nuts,—men assuredly from whom proceeded those everlasting warnings to their fellow-prisoners who buzzed angrily around Paul: "Touch not, taste not, handle not."[1] They also maintained communications with the outside world by means of their followers, and were greatly admired by their friends in Jerusalem for their conduct.

Paul was in a similar position. The centurion had received orders "that he should be kept in charge, and should have indulgence; and not to forbid any of his friends to minister unto him."[2] It must of course be remembered that the Acts, looking at the Roman officials of its own day, invariably represents the Roman courts as acting very gently towards Paul. Still the

[1] Vita, 3, and Col. iii. 21. [2] Acts xxiv. 23.

Epistle to the Colossians so far agrees with this account that we see Paul, when the letter was written, surrounded by the whole company who had followed him from Philippi to Jerusalem, together with some others who had joined him meanwhile.[1] First and foremost he has the faithful Timothy and his ready pen.[2] Tychicus is prepared to keep up communications with the churches of Asia Minor.[3] Aristarchus comes from Thessalonica with Macedonian fidelity to share his prison, so as to be always ready to help him,[4] in refreshing contrast to the worldly temper of his countryman Demas, in whose favour Paul can only say that he is present, though he soon withdraws entirely from this Christian connection.[5] Luke, whom Paul now learns to value as a physician,[6] makes up for this by warmer fidelity. Before long, these companions of his journey were joined by others from Jerusalem, Galatia and Asia;[7] a fact which confirms the picture drawn by the writer of the Acts, who undoubtedly had Luke's own account before him.

The account which our author gives of the trial of this undistinguished prisoner by the Roman governor and the Jewish king, is only intelligible as implying that the procurator had the prisoners brought before him in batches from time to time, when—a characteristic mark of his administration—he called in his Jewish wife Drusilla to help him discover which of the rebellious prophets and fanatical assassins, the leaders of sects and recalcitrant priests among his prisoners, were to be considered dangerous and which harmless. Paul was placed in the latter category by the daughter of Agrippa; still, according to the slightly ironical account in the Acts, Felix and Drusilla preferred to hear Paul's discourse of justification, chastity and approaching judgment, at a more convenient season. That a

[1] Col. iv. 10, seq.; Philem. 23.
[2] Col. i. 1; Philem. 1.
[3] Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12.
[4] Col. iv. 10; Acts xix. 29, xx. 4.
[5] Col. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. iv. 10.
[6] Col. iv. 14.
[7] Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 9—12; Crescens, Titus.

man like Felix should repeatedly bring Paul before his tribunal in order to squeeze money from the penniless weaver, is undoubtedly an embellishment of the author's, whose recollection of the greed of the Claudian freedmen is out of place.

Two documents have come down to us from the two years' captivity at Cæsarea: one, the Epistle to the Colossians, which requires critical revision; the other, the Epistle to Philemon, which together set before us the situation of the Apostle at Cæsarea. The former is only to be restored as the foundation of the canonical Epistle to the Colossians by a process of criticism which cannot be repeated here;[1] the Epistle to the Ephesians being a still freer composition by the same author, who introduced passages of his own into the Epistle to the Colossians, and incorporated numerous fragments of the true Epistle to the Colossians into this work.

We learn from this short Epistle of Paul's that a Christian church had sprung up at Colossæ, in the Phrygian district of the province of Asia, and desired to be connected with Paul. Colossæ itself was a town of commercial importance,[2] and at this period rapidly increasing, so that its total destruction soon after by the great earthquake of 61 did not mean annihilation. During his work in Galatia and the sea-board towns of Asia, Paul had frequently passed through Phrygia,[3] but had never worked there. His own foundation of churches both east and west of Colossæ easily explains the origin of a church there based on his principles. Epaphras, a Colossian friend of Paul, and his personal connections in the family of Philemon, were probably instrumental in the matter.[4] This small and recently founded church consisted almost entirely of Gentile Christians,[5] and was fundamentally Pauline in character. Its meeting-place was sometimes the house of a certain Nymphas, sometimes that

[1] Cf. Holtzmann, Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe: Leipzig, 1872.
[2] Strabo, xii. 16, 8; Plin. v. 41.
[3] Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23.
[4] Col. i. 7, 8, iv. 12, 13.
[5] Col. i. 11, 27, ii. 11, 13.

of Philemon, whose son or brother Archippus acted as leader in the absence of the founder Epaphras.[1] An additional reason for the church's desire to attach itself to Paul was that Paul had converted Philemon, his wife Apphia and Archippus—elsewhere, it need hardly be said, perhaps in Ephesus, for the Apostle never came to Colossæ.

Epaphras, again, had carried the gospel on to Laodicea,[2] a neighbouring city of much greater importance, and had held meetings in the equally important city of Hierapolis.[3] At the time of the Apocalypse, this church of Laodicea was growing lukewarm and worldly from its wealth and prosperity. At this early period, however, these churches were all launched upon the same career of development, with the same ecclesiastical needs; as indeed follows directly from Paul's command that the people of Laodicea and Colossæ should exchange the epistles they had respectively received from him.[4] What was good for one, he thought good for the other.

Now the question at issue in either case was their attitude to the Jewish law. This appears to have been Epaphras' purpose in coming to the Holy Land, for the churches he represented wished to settle the question directly with the primitive apostles. Epaphras, indeed, appears on behalf of the Phrygian churches exactly as Paul once came to Jerusalem on behalf of the Galatian churches. Paul testifies to his exertions in their cause,[5] and his great labour for the brethren of Colossæ, Laodicea and Hierapolis.[6] On this journey to Jerusalem, Epaphras evidently promised Paul in Cæsarea to share his captivity for a while, as was permitted by the *custodia libera*,[7] in order to give him a full and detailed report. Paul was thus moved to deliver his deci-

[1] Philem. 1, 2. [2] Cf. supra, Vol. iii. p. 273.

[3] Col. iv. 13. [4] Col. iv. 16, ii. 1. [5] Col. iv. 12.

[6] Col. iv. 13. I consider the whole of the conclusion of the Epistle to be genuine, except the words in verse 12, ἐν παντὶ τῷ θεοῦ. Removing this interpolation, the sense is as above.

[7] Philem. 23.

sion upon the question which had now reached Phrygia; and he did so with the brevity called for by his want of personal acquaintance with the situation. His Epistle was designed to prove his concern in the matter, and to give his sanction to Epaphras, who indeed had simply been labouring in the spirit of Paul. The Colossians might be assured that Paul recognized them as his own, for all that they did not know his face any more than the brethren of Laodicea. The struggle for freedom from the law now undertaken by him in Judæa is actually on behalf of those who had never seen his face.[1]

After this personal matter, the essential and fundamental idea of the Epistle is his theology; the new birth in the death of Christ has removed us from the law of the flesh, and transferred us to the sphere of the spirit. Those who are born anew have a circumcision without hands, of the heart. They are never to be troubled more with the notions of the Essenes and Pharisees; not to be harassed about meat and drink, nor holy days and sabbaths and new moons. They are dead to this world and its ordinances; their life is hidden in God. For this reason, as being members of Christ, they are to put on mercy and goodness, humility, meekness and long-suffering. Such are the true Pauline ideas which the Apostle avows to the Christians of Phrygia in their turn, as the pith and marrow of his gospel. He briefly reviews his personal position, for Tychicus, the bearer of the Epistle on his way home to proconsular Asia, can give all needful information on that point. We simply receive the impression that Paul awaits the development of events in a calm and composed spirit; that he hears with joy of the growth of the gospel without, and, far more secure than John the Baptist twenty years before in the walls of Machærus, lives in the faith that the strong man is standing before the gate to burn sinners with inextinguishable fire.

Further, when the account in the Life of Josephus, who attended the above-mentioned priests in prison,[2] as Aristarchus

[1] Col. ii. 1. [2] Vita, 3.

and Epaphras attended Paul, is compared with the notices from Paul's Epistles, it may be surmised that the war of opinion was not entirely stilled even in captivity. The numerous patriots, who at that time comprised the majority of the prisoners, attempted to continue their Jewish life as far as they could, though in a Gentile prison.[1] They preferred to live on nothing but figs and nuts, brought to them by Jewish hands, rather than be defiled by the Gentiles' prison-fare. They diligently fulfilled the law in other respects also, keeping the sabbath and feast-days. Such were the impressions under which Paul wrote: "God hath blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us; and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross. Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a feast-day, or a new moon, or a sabbath-day, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind. If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances, Handle not, nor taste, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using), to the indulgence of the flesh."[2] Recalling the words of Jesus, "Be seasoned with salt,"[3] he might have been led into inevitable discussions with his fellow-prisoners upon the deeper sense of this saying. He had indeed flung a stinging handful of salt into the eyes of the voluptuous and curious Drusilla, when he avowed to her, the adulteress, that his gospel dealt above all with righteousness, self-control, and the coming judgment.[4]

His relations with his fellow-prisoners are merely conjectural; but we reach firmer ground in the fact that the Apostle's relations with the Christians of Palestine were anything but cordial. His companion, the Colossian Epaphras, seems indeed to have engaged in bitter discussions with the mother church on behalf

[1] Josephus, l. c.

[2] Col. ii. 14, seq. Reconstruction of the original text in Holtzmann, 156, seq.

[3] Col. iv. 6; cf. Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 49, 50.

[4] Cf. Acts xxiv. 25 with Col. iv. 6.

of the Gentile Christians of Phrygia. The same difficulties were made with the churches of Colossæ, Laodicea and Hierapolis, as formerly with those of Galatia.[1] But between Paul and Jerusalem there was no communication whatever. With the exception of John Mark, who, remembering his old teacher, came down from his home in Jerusalem to Cæsarea and was reconciled to his fellow-missionary, like his cousin Barnabas before him,[2] Paul kept up a friendship only with a certain Justus Jesus, who cannot be identified with any one we know of from other sources.[3] Mark, indeed, now resumes his connection with Asia Minor, and is supposed to have been introduced to the Colossians and Laodiceans by Tychicus, though on this point further documentary evidence is necessary.[4]

Closely connected with the Epistle to the Colossians is another letter of the Apostle's, addressed to a Colossian, Philemon, while the former epistle is addressed to the church which assembled in his house. It was written at the same time, and despatched by the same bearer, Tychicus.[5] Its contents are of a purely private nature.[6]

[1] Col. iv. 13. [2] 1 Cor. ix. 6.

[3] Col. iv. 11. [4] Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11, 12.

[5] Cf. Col. iv. 9 with the substance of the Epistle to Philemon.

[6] The Epistle to Philemon also shows traces of interpolations by the same writer who interpolated in the Epistle to the Colossians and wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians. Verses 5 and 6 clearly proceed from him, and not from Paul. Verse 12 also, and the five-fold reference to Paul as the prisoner in verses 1, 10, 13, 22, 23, recall the manner in which the interpolator of the Epistle to the Colossians makes his Paul clank his chains every now and again.—It is long, moreover, since the question as to the genuineness of the whole passage has been seriously enough considered. Apart from the lateness of external attestation, there are grave internal considerations. Baur's objections I consider insufficient. Supposing that the runaway Onesimus, in his helpless situation, deliberately sought out Paul, or that Tychicus or Epaphras brought him to Paul, all romantic complications vanish. Nor is it right to hold that the story represents the idea of re-union. The thought that Christianity unites in a higher sphere things severed in this world, and teaches them mutual love, cannot be maintained against the plain realism of the document. This is a re-union

Another Colossian now appears before Paul, in addition to Epaphras, who was well known in the city, and Tychicus, who was about to return there. This was Onesimus, a slave of Philemon, from whom he had run away. Either Onesimus had spontaneously sought Paul's mediation, or had been found by Epaphras and brought before Paul, or had come by chance. The upshot was that Paul was in a position to restore the slave to his friend at Colossæ. The cause of his flight was some wrong Onesimus had done his master. He had either caused him loss or been guilty of embezzlement. Paul now proposed to set the matter right. In the first place, Onesimus had become his pupil; the Apostle had admitted him into the church, and called him his beloved son "whom he had begotten in his bonds."

He would gladly have kept Onesimus with him, but his sense of right would not endure wrong unatoned for. Tychicus there-

in which Onesimus obviously fears a too speedy acquaintance with the lash, and the object of the epistle is simply to save him from this fate.—It might rather be asked whether the object of the epistle is not to show the wrongfulness of a slave running away or hiding, or of aiding his escape; or, again, to establish an apostolic standard in respect to the question whether the Christian is bound to set free his Christian slaves.—It is clear from 1 Cor. vii. 21, seq., Eph. vi. 5, seq., Col. iii. 22, seq., Rev. xviii. 13, 1 Tim. vi. 1, seq., and Tit. ii. 9, that this slave question was vigorously discussed. Against this view is the fact that our document offers no general principles, but only gives points applicable to the individual case; and that even if it were devised to establish an apostolic rule for the slave-question in an individual case, the writer would not have expressed himself so hypothetically that no one can say at the end whether Philemon is bound to set Onesimus free or not.—Some connection is to be suspected between verses 5 and 6 and the interpolator of the Epistle to the Colossians; on the other hand, the vivid, compressed style is the opposite of the rhetorical breadth of the Epistle to the Ephesians and the interpolations of the Epistle to the Colossians. The plays upon words, indeed, indicate a supreme freedom in command of language which would be astonishing in Paul. Yet the Apostle is fond of such plays upon words. Cf. Gal. iv. 25, v. 12; Phil. iii. 2, 3, iii. 19, so that the play upon *ἄχρηστος* and *εὔχρηστος*, *Ὀνήσιμος* and *ὀνίνασθαι*, are not in themselves astonishing. The epistle certainly stands or falls by the personal references of the Epistle to the Colossians, with which it is closely bound up; but to my mind it is by no means proved that these actual references did not belong to Paul's original epistle.

fore, who was being sent to visit the Phrygian churches, should take the new convert back to Philemon. The runaway's submission is one of the strongest instances of Paul's influence over men's minds. If the master lodged a complaint, the slave would be branded on the cheek or the back, and sent to the treadmill or the quarries.[1] Nevertheless, Onesimus was ready to go, never doubting but that his master would respect the Apostle's intercession. This letter of reconciliation is itself an admirable example of the sympathetic manner in which the Apostle dealt with personal matters of the kind. He cordially recommends his son Onesimus to the forgiveness of Philemon, and declares himself ready to be responsible for any loss he has caused. He jestingly observes that Onesimus, the "profitable," was an unprofitable servant, but would now display brotherly helpfulness instead of neglect.[2] Nor does he forget a warm greeting to the beloved Apphia, who had a voice in settling these domestic matters.

Further information we have none about the sojourn at Cæsarea. The Clementines, it is true, make this the scene of the chief Apostle Peter's great discussion with "the Magus," who was sharply called to account for certain assumptions in his Epistle to the Corinthians, and disrespectful expressions in that to the Galatians; but the only historical value of it all is that, in the memory of the Jewish Christians, Cæsarea was indissolubly connected with the name of Paul. Paul himself, writing to Philemon, reckoned so certainly on his immediate release, that he jokingly bids Apphia prepare her guest-chamber for him. At this moment affairs took a turn which utterly ended his hopes.

Claudius Antonius Felix was recalled. Tidings of the real state of Judæa had at last reached the ears of Burrus, after the streets of Cæsarea had been the scene of open tumult. The self-importance of the Jewish population, fostered by the utter weakness of the Roman administration, had gradually led to dis-

[1] The usual brand was ϕ, or F V G, i.e. fugit = "has run away."

[2] He takes him back as *χρηστον*, instead of *ἄχρηστον*.

turbances between Gentiles and Jews in the seat of government. The Jews declared it was a Jewish city, and to be publicly administered as such; the Syrians explained that though Herod built the city, he had built it for the Gentiles, and therefore established it on a Gentile basis.

Every evening disorderly crowds gathered together on either side; sometimes the leaders fought in single combat, sometimes there was indiscriminate street-fighting. Once more the Roman garrison, which consisted in part of Samaritans, took part in the quarrel. They had the more excuse for doing so, because, as Josephus admits, the worst provocation came from the Jews. "The Jewish inhabitants," he says, "who were proud of their wealth and despised the Syrians, pursued the latter with insults to provoke them to acts of violence."

The consequence was that the Syrian troops sided with the persecuted party, and when the procurator's personal appeal to the Jewish populace was only the sign for further outrage, Felix sent the soldiers against them, and gave up the houses of the ringleaders for plunder. The question in dispute he referred to the emperor, a proceeding which resulted in his own recall. Perhaps, too, a change of governors was demanded by Corbulo, the general of the Parthian war, who had succeeded on the death of Felix's patron, the proconsul Quadratus, in the autumn of 60, for it was impossible to leave in his rear a state of affairs such as existed in Judæa.[1] Moreover, a revolution had occurred in the capital. Felix's brother Pallas had been banished in 56; and the new administrator of the imperial treasury, Claudius Etruscus, passed for a loyal minister who would deal sharply with his subordinates.[2]

At all events, the government appeared to be in earnest. Cæsarea was declared a Gentile city, which the Jews did not hesitate to ascribe to the corruption of Burrus the pedagogue

[1] Quadratus, the patron of Felix, Tac. Ann. xii. 54; Corbulo, xiii. 8, xiv. 26.

[2] Cf. Schiller, Nero, 343.

and the influence of the fallen Pallas, instead of their own turbulence. Portius Festus, the new procurator, who succeeded Felix in the spring of 61, immediately attacked the scourge of the country, the banditti, whom he cleverly cut off and destroyed in detail. The highways were once more thick with crosses on which the patriots died by slow torture, while crowds of prisoners were brought into Cæsarea. In the midst of these occupations, the procurator had little time to attend to each individual case before his tribunal. He heard nothing of Paul till he went to Jerusalem, and the new high-priest,[1] Ishmael ben Phabi, assured him in the name of the Sanhedrin that the prisoner had been wrongfully withdrawn from his own jurisdiction. Festus had no time to spare; Paul was at Cæsarea, and he could not wait; but their chief men might come down to his court, and the question should be decided there.

But the new trial was abortive, as before; Paul definitely denied having undertaken anything contrary to the law, or the temple, or the emperor. The question of pacifying the country was naturally so all-important to the procurator, that he gladly resolved to give up Paul to be judged by the Sanhedrin. But the consequences of this decision were so clear to the Apostle that he would not submit to it. He formally appealed to Cæsar. Festus conferred for a moment with his legal advisers; and then declared: "Thou hast appealed unto Cæsar: unto Cæsar shalt thou go."

The prisoner, who was now bound for Rome, wanted for nothing in Cæsarea, and there was nothing to prevent him from embarking on the next transport. But the procurator's report of his case had to be laid before the emperor's throne, as a basis for further proceedings. Festus felt quite at sea among the dogmatic quarrels of his new subjects, yet the immense majority of the fanatics imprisoned at Cæsarea were in some way involved in this matter of religion. At this opportune moment appeared king Agrippa, who with his sister, the notorious beauty Bernice,

[1] Ant. xx. 8, 8.

was paying a round of visits to his allies, and had come to show his devotion to the new procurator. The king being invested with the superintendence of the temple and the duty of advising the procurator of the day upon matters of Jewish ritual, a new trial was instituted. There is nothing remarkable in the fact that Paul underwent another examination under Agrippa among other prisoners who had been arrested on religious charges. The writer's imagination is more likely responsible for the presence of Bernice, so well known to a later generation, who attends the trial "with great pomp" (μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας). On the other hand, the course of the trial as related is what may have happened at scores of such trials. The judge listens patiently until the prisoner comes to the eschatological hopes of Jewish believers, whereupon the occidental interrupts the oriental, wondering whether a man who looks for the return of the Messiah on the clouds of heaven can be in his right mind. But his Jewish assessor, appealed to by the prisoner to testify that these hopes are really part of the Jewish faith, prefers to give an evasive answer. All this might have happened a hundred times in trials of Jews and Christians; all that can be unhistorical in the historian's application of it is the way in which he makes Paul the centre of Festus' judicial business, whereas it may be presumed that the Apostle of Christ played quite a secondary part among those who had rebelled for religion's sake. For the rest, the judges, according to the Acts, were agreed that Paul, who had not been concerned in any riot or breach of the law, might have been set free if he had not already appealed. As it was, things must be left to take their course.

---

4. Christian Persecution in Judæa.

The calm which followed the arrival of Portius Festus in the little province was of short duration. The upheaval began early

in 62, in the great battle-fields of the upper Euphrates. The proconsul Pætus was utterly defeated by the Parthians, his army captured, and the Herodian Tigranes driven out of Armenia. Victory seemed suddenly to incline to the East; the rebellious prophecy of Judæa could not fail to receive a fresh impulse. Nothing of importance could be undertaken in face of Festus' prudent measures, so long as Corbulo's legions lay on the northern frontier. But no one could doubt that the first defeat of Corbulo would rouse the Jews, and after them the Arabs. The bands of assassins were continually increasing. Every day brought tidings of new raids and new incendiarism. A new prophet also came forward, announcing the certain advent of the day of salvation, and trying to draw off the people to the wilderness in rear of the Romans, where the trumpet of the Messiah was to sound. Nine times deceived, the multitude streamed for the tenth time down every ravine into the Ghor to join the Messiah; but Festus sent out his cavalry at the right moment, and they were dispersed, taken, or cut to pieces.[1] The prophet himself was among the slain; but, sooner or later, the spirit aroused a new prophet, and Festus had gained nothing.

Things would perhaps have been entirely different if Rome had had a party among the Jews to direct her course. Far from this, the Jewish king appointed to assist the procurator in religious questions was himself a source of endless perplexity. Ananias Nebedai had been removed by Agrippa when the full violence of his character had come to light in the proceedings against Paul. But even after this deposition, the fierce priest, with his armed myrmidons from the temple, ruled the streets and storehouses of Jerusalem, and managed to maintain respect by means of bribery and violence. His successor appointed by Agrippa was Ishmael ben Phabi, who comes with the spear of Phinehas, and is renowned in the annals of the Rabbis for a state-robe worth 100 minæ, worked for him by his mother.[2] In full accord with his predecessor, Ishmael ben Phabi continued

[1] Ant. xx. 8, 10. [2] In Derenbourg, op. cit. p. 234.

the struggle about the tithes, conducting it partly by citations from the Scripture, partly by paving-stones.

It was not long before he, too, fell out with Agrippa about the affairs of the temple. The king, like the rest of his family, was attached to the Pharisees, but the standard of orthodoxy at all suited to a Herod had long ceased to satisfy the growing demands of the time. The first thing to land him in difficulties was his hereditary passion for architecture. He got into very bad odour for the buildings with which he adorned Cæsarea Philippi, and for the erection of theatres and other Gentile enormities at Berytus. In Jerusalem he had to oppose some senseless building projects of the ostentatious Sadducees, who preferred spending the temple treasure on buildings, to leaving it for the procurator to plunder at will; but in his own schemes of building he met with a disaster into which he dragged the procurator. The king had the old palace of the Maccabees restored with a view to the future. "As it was placed," says Josephus, "on a conspicuous height, it commanded a magnificent view of the city. This gave Agrippa great pleasure, and lying here on his cushions, he could watch all that went on in the temple." Thereupon Ishmael ben Phabi and Ananias protested that it was contrary to the law for what went on in the temple to be watched from without. They demanded the erection of a wall to protect the holy ground from curious eyes. So a wall was built which cut off the view, not only from his palace, but also from the castle of Antonia.

This angered the king, but angered Festus still more. At the feast of Pentecost, 59, his predecessor had been able to rush down from Antonia in time save a Nazarene from the ill-treatment of the mob. On many other occasions, too, the situation of the stronghold had been of equal importance. The procurator therefore ordered the wall to be demolished, but the Jews appealed to Cæsar. Poppæa, who had now been converted to the faith,[1] and therefore favoured all Jewish petitioners, found

[1] Ant. xx. 8, 11; Vita, 3; Tac. Ann. xvi. 6; Hist. i. 22.

Agrippa's conduct sadly wanting in piety, and induced Nero, now religiously inclined, to admit the scruples of the Jews. The king, to whom the care of the temple was committed, was thus worsted in a matter which, strictly speaking, fell within his competence, and furthermore involved Festus in his defeat. Yet it was greatly to his advantage that the Roman government detained the envoys, Ishmael ben Phabi and Helkias, as hostages to prevent further friction. Ishmael thus succeeded in saving the wall which blocked out the procurator, but did not return to his native land. Three of his sons being afterwards found among the defenders of Jerusalem, his life became forfeit as a hostage, and he was beheaded at Cyrene in the year 70.[1]

These circumstances, however, did not make Agrippa more cautious. He installed a son of the high-priest Simon, Joseph Cabi, who afterwards joined the party of revolt,[2] and now was soon deposed in his turn. Agrippa next chose Annas, son of that elder Annas whom the Gospels count among the murderers of Jesus, and who received the name of the Fortunate from his contemporaries.[3] A worse choice could not have been made. Hard-hearted and covetous, he was among the most intimate associates of Ananias Nebedai. He had been his fellow-prisoner at Rome on account of the feud with the Samaritans, and, with his son Eleazar, had taken an active share in his struggle about the tithes.[4] They were further united by a common hatred of the Christians. Annas brought James before the Sanhedrin, as Ananias had brought Paul. Their ways lay together till the outbreak of the revolt, when Ananias became the victim, Annas the leader, of the revolution.[5]

But anarchy was not yet so rampant that the future leader of the war-Sanhedrin could remain high-priest for long; nevertheless, his reign of terror lasted long enough for the Nazarenes to feel the sanguinary hate of the family of Annas. The persistence of the sect made them more sensitive to the

[1] Bell. vi. 2, 2. [2] Ibid. [3] Ant. xx. 9, 1.
[4] Ant. xx. 9, 3. [5] Bell. iv. 3, 9; 5, 2.

charge that a priest of their house had crucified the Messiah. Possibly, too, the discussions over the trial of Paul directed the attention of the priests anew to the spread of Christianity among the Dispersion. The opinion of Eusebius, at all events, is, that Paul's visit was in the end fraught with the gravest consequences for the primitive church.[1] Moreover, it would have been absurd to leave the Nazarenes of Jerusalem in security after all these fruitless efforts against Paul.

Annas, then, followed in the steps of his predecessors Ananias and Ishmael, but with the greater decision natural to him. "The younger Annas," says Josephus, "was a man of hot temper and very audacious, and followed the sect of the Sadducees, who are more severe in punishing offenders than all other Jews, as I have already shown. As Annas therefore was of such a disposition, he thought he had now a good opportunity, as Festus was now dead and Albinus was still on the road. So he assembled the Sanhedrin, and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others, and having accused them as breakers of the law, he delivered them over to be stoned."[2] To the other horrors of anarchy, religious persecution was now added. The interregnum which ensued—Festus having succumbed after a year to the inexpressible exertions of his office and the unaccustomed climate, and Albinus, the newly appointed procurator, being unable to reach his post immediately—Annas hoped to employ by exercising power once more to its fullest extent. Despite the resistance of the Pharisees, in which Josephus joined,[3] James the brother of Jesus, the aged bishop of the church, together with a number of other leading Nazarenes, fell a victim to a cold-blooded judicial murder. In the following century the church was able to give a more detailed account of this event than was given by the Jewish historian who was so close to the actual trial. According to Hegesippus,[4] James the Just was personally solicited by lawyers and Pharisees in this time of religious disturb-

[1] Ant. xx. 9, 1. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] In Euseb. ii. 23.

ance, to bring back the people from their error, for they were more and more penetrated by the belief that Jesus was the Christ. James accordingly promised to speak out on the matter, and demanded to address the people at the Passover from the terrace of the outer forecourt. The Rabbis cried to him, "Thou just man, in whom we must needs all believe, the people in their error follow Jesus the crucified; tell us the truth about him." Then James replied with a loud voice, "What ask ye me of Jesus, the Son of Man? He sitteth in heaven on the right hand of power, and will one day come in the clouds of heaven." Instantly the Nazarenes scattered among the multitude lifted up their voices on every side and shouted, "Hosanna to the Son of David." But the Zealots, exasperated at the defeat they had brought upon themselves, rushed up and flung down the just man from the wall of the temple into the street below, where the people stoned him. After his fall, he struggled to his knees, and so prayed: "I pray thee, Lord God, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Now he had lived as an Essene; therefore a priest of the same Essene tendency ("one of the sons of Rechab, the son of Rechabim") attempted to save the martyr. But while he tried to shelter him from the stones as he knelt there, a fuller darted out from close by with the fuller's staff used for pressing clothes, and battered in the head of the brother of Jesus. According to this tradition, James was buried at the end of the temple street, where his tomb was still shown in the time of Hegesippus.

Although death is made to come upon the martyr in so many forms, this account is so far consistent with Josephus' account that the law at this period ordered the condemned man to be flung down from a height by the witnesses before being stoned. If after this he remained alive, the witnesses were to cast a heavy stone on his heart, and the people around to fling stones at him till he died.[1] But it is certain that the temple was not the scene of such executions, apart from which the whole setting

[1] Sanhedrin, capp. xvi. and xv.

of the story has a mythical tone. According to other sources, Eusebius relates, more in harmony with Josephus, that the miscarriage of Paul's indictment so exasperated the Jews, that they dragged James before the Sanhedrin to make him publicly confess that his brother who died upon the cross was not the Christ. But when, contrary to expectation, the aged leader of the Nazarene community, nothing daunted, cried aloud that Jesus the crucified was the Messiah, who should come again upon the clouds of heaven, his avowal was too much for their patience, and, honoured as he was by the whole people for his asceticism, they put him to death.[1] Clement of Alexandria, on the contrary, agrees with Hegesippus' account, telling how James was flung down from the temple, and then killed by a fuller's cudgel.[2]

Josephus, however, being at the time a member of the higher priesthood at Jerusalem, his testimony is decisive, viz. that after a formal examination before the Sanhedrin, James and his fellow-martyrs were condemned to stoning. But it remains uncertain which of the twelve Apostles shared the fate of Jesus' brother. Papias indeed, the indefatigable collector of apostolic tradition, tells us, in the next century, that John the son of Zebedee was also put to death by the Jews.[3] In all probability, then, he is to be placed among the other victims mentioned by Josephus. It is further to be remarked that, six years after this, the Apocalypse supposes all the Apostles, with perhaps two exceptions, to have passed away.[4] Those, therefore, who now escaped, met their fate in the ensuing troubles. The only Apostles not known to the next century as martyrs are Matthias, Philip and Thomas.[5] Again, Jesus' prophecy that the sons of Zebedee should both drink of the same cup that he drank,[6] would

[1] Euseb. ii. 23, *ad init.* [2] Euseb. ii. 1.

[3] Papias *ap.* Georgios Hamartolos, in the passage cited by Nolte, Theol. Quartalschrift, 44 Jahrg. p. 466.

[4] Rev. xviii. 20, xxi. 14.

[5] Clem. Strom. iv. 9, 73, according to the testimony of Heracleon.

[6] Matt. xx. 23.

infallibly have been emended if it had not been fulfilled in the course of events.

There is one point, however, in which both the Jewish and the Christian accounts are in remarkable agreement. The Pharisaic and Essene elements among the people regarded the blow dealt by the Sadducees against the Christians as an attempt upon the very hopes and principles of the popular party. Even the Zealots could not be more uncompromising, more hostile to the Gentiles and more patriotic, than the Apocalypse, which expresses the Christian view in the last ten years of the Jewish state. The rain of fire, and the seven and yet other seven vials of wrath poured out upon Rome by the writer of the Apocalypse, glow with the same fiery hate which burns in the breast of the Zealot. Not only is James described as an Essene by Hegesippus in an exaggerated manner bordering upon myth, but the Apocalypse glorifies those who have not defiled themselves with women, and denounces the attempt to release the children of Israel from the law of meats as the teaching of Balaam.[1]

Thus as the strain grew more intense, the little remnant of the primitive Church became more and more a school of ascetics, a community of the strictest legalism; which is the key not only to the tradition that the people venerated James as a saint, and that a son of Rechab, an Essene, endeavoured to save him, but also to the entirely historical testimony of Josephus, that those who were most indignant at the persecution of the Christians were precisely the extreme Zealots and supporters of the law.

The latter immediately sent a deputation to king Agrippa, begging him to call Annas to account; some even journeyed to meet the new procurator Albinus on his way from Alexandria, and represented the ill-treatment of the Christians to him as an infringement of the procurator's rights, only to be wiped out by deposition of the high-handed Sadducee. In due course Albinus

[1] Rev. xiv. 3–5, ii. 14.

inaugurated his government with a minatory letter to the Sanhedrin. Agrippa, who might reasonably fear the entire loss of the supervision of the temple, found it advisable to anticipate the storm by deposing Annas, though he had only worn the high-priest's fillet for three months, and putting Damnæus in his place. The Romans and Agrippa thus gained a dangerous enemy in the younger Annas, who forthwith allied himself with the party of revolution, and soon found a great position and a tragic end as leader of the Jewish revolt. The Christian persecution, so far as it proceeded from the Sadducees, ended with the fall of the sons of Annas. It is indeed most probable that it was renewed at the outbreak of the war three years later; for though Ananias Nebedai, Paul's judge, soon left the scene, Annas and his son Eleazar, the great adversaries of Jesus, still remained at the head of the movement.

Sixth Division.

PAUL IN ROME.

PAUL IN ROME.

1. The Apostle's Journey.

Paul left Judæa a few months before the outbreak of the Christian persecution in Palestine. Festus had acceded to his request, and let him carry his case before the officials of the imperial court. This turn of affairs, it is clear, came unexpectedly on the Apostle, or he would not have parted shortly before with his most trusty disciples, sending Timothy to Ephesus, Tychicus to Phrygia, Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. He could then count with the greater certainty upon the three friends who remained—Luke, Aristarchus and Demas—accompanying him on his journey. The Apostle was not deceived in the two former; but Demas thought it impossible to neglect his private affairs in Thessalonica so long, and went off in a manner that did little credit to himself and caused deep pain to his captive master.[1] Luke, however, who accompanied the Apostle, has left us a detailed and vivid account of the Apostle's journey, which has been incorporated almost unaltered in the Acts.

The storms of autumn began earlier than usual in the year 61. The ancients generally ceased navigation in the latter half of November;[2] but this year September was unseasonable and stormy.[3] Another transport, carrying a number of Jewish prisoners, together with the young Josephus and his legalist friends we heard of in Cæsarea, was wrecked in the Adriatic,

[1] Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 9—14.

[2] Veget. De re milit. iv. 39.

[3] Acts xxvii. 9.

and went down with six hundred men.[1] Under these circumstances, the voyage was not without peril. Paul was attached to a body of prisoners in charge of a centurion Julius, a prætorian who must have come to Palestine on some special mission. There being no ship of sufficient size in the harbour of Cæsarea sailing direct to Rome, the centurion took a ship of Adrammyttium bound for the chief places on the coast of Asia Minor, where better means of transport might be expected. Luke and Aristarchus had no difficulty in taking passage by the same ship, so as to be near Paul.

The voyage began well. With a fair wind, they covered sixty-seven miles in one day, as far as Sidon.[2] Thus early in the voyage Paul was agreeably surprised to find himself under the orders of no casual provincial, but of a humane and cultured man. While the ship lay in the harbour until the master had finished his business, he received permission from the centurion to go ashore with the rest to visit the brethren and be cared for by them. But now the south-west wind, which befriended them before, prevented their taking the shortest route to Myra, their next port of call. They had first to tack along the coast of Asia Minor, and then, when under the lee of Cyprus, to take advantage of the land-breeze. So they fetched a circuit by the sea of Cilicia and Pamphylia, and reached Myra after great loss of time.

Here the centurion found a ship of Alexandria, carrying wheat to Italy, and recommended by superior safety, if not speed. It held altogether 276 persons. But the wind remained unfavourable. To cover the 130 miles to Cnidus required a time out of all proportion to the distance; and once there, the wind sprang up so strong from the north-west that it was impossible to put in, and the ship had great difficulty in beating up against the wind to

[1] The date of Jos. Vita, iii. is also the end of 61.

[2] The most accurate measurements and calculations on this point are in James Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul: London, 1848.

Crete, under the lee of which it worked along to Cape Matala. Here the land turns suddenly back to the north. Great care was required in reaching Fair Havens, as it was called, not far from Lasos. Here they had to stop. After losing so much time, it would have been madness to continue the voyage to Italy. They could only look about for a port in which to winter. Paul tried to persuade the centurion to stay at Fair Havens, for previous voyages had taught him the perils of the Greek seas. Three times he had suffered shipwreck, and had drifted on a piece of wreckage for a day and a night. But the seamen thought to find better winter-quarters south of Cape Matala, where they would sooner catch the earliest east winds when navigation began again. They decided, therefore, to take advantage of a gentle south wind, and get the ship to the harbour of Phœnix (now Lutro), north-east of the island of Claude. But when they got past Cape Matala, and were about to cross the open bay behind the foreland, a violent north wind suddenly struck the ship and drove it out to sea. In a little time they saw the island of Claude (now Gozzo) disappear behind them as they drove on and on. The ship, too, seems to have sprung several leaks, for by the next day the crew were compelled to throw out ballast to keep her from sinking. The north-easter continuing, there was every prospect of being cast away upon the sand-banks of Africa; all the sailors could do was to furl sails, gird the hull round with ropes, and lash the helm fast. The hold gradually filling with water, they were compelled, after sacrificing all the tackle, to cut away the mast on the third day, and heave it overboard with the help of the passengers.

Then follow a terrible eleven days. Neither sun nor moon could be seen; it was impossible to ascertain their position, and the sailors gave themselves up for lost. The storm rendered cooking and regular meals impossible; continual watching and pumping had exhausted their strength, and general dejection ensued. It was one of those occasions in which civil rank yields to true personal worth. The officers having ceased to

issue orders, Paul assumed authority and sought to encourage the despondent. His certainty of a future, of a vocation still to be fulfilled, was not shaken by the desperate situation of the moment. He had seen himself in a dream before the emperor's judgment-seat, and took this as an assurance of divine aid. We are not told how far his words had power to master the despair of the situation, but they found confirmation. It was the fourteenth night when the crew were convinced, presumably by the unmistakable sound of breakers, that they were close to shore. They heaved the lead, and found twenty fathoms, and a little later, fifteen. To avoid being dashed on the cliffs, they cast anchor and hoped for daybreak. The sailors, indeed, were unwilling to wait for dawn, and made attempts to secure their own safety; but Paul saw through their attempt to leave passengers and soldiers in the lurch, and since he had become, as it were, the spokesman for the former, he called the centurion's attention to the threatened danger. The soldiers instantly cut away the ropes and let the boat drift away. As morning broke, a meal was eaten on board for the last time, each eating as much as he chose; then provisions and corn were flung into the sea; the sailors cut away the anchor, and casting loose the helm and setting the foresail (artemon) before the wind, they made for the beach.

The place were the ship ran ashore is shown to this day in Malta in St. Paul's Bay. The forepart stuck fast on the sandbank which formed the edge of the bay; the stern was dashed to pieces by the shock and the breakers. All were now preparing to make their escape to the neighbouring shore, when the soldiers, agreeably to custom and the responsibility laid upon them, demanded to kill the prisoners, lest any should run away. Now among these prisoners, whatever offscourings of humanity they also contained, was Paul, whose intellectual power had more than once astonished the centurion during the voyage. The latter took the responsibility on himself, and bade those who could swim first cast themselves into the water; the rest might let

themselves be carried to shore on planks and other pieces of floating wreckage.

The shipwrecked party now learned at last that they were in Malta. Even the sailors, who probably knew only the usual harbour on the west side (Valetta), had been quite in the dark as to the coast before them. The statement that the ship took fourteen days to cover the distance from Claude to Malta, allows a speed of about one-and-a-half nautical miles an hour, which agrees with other experiences of the same kind.

There was, of course, no thought of continuing the journey; the winter had to be passed in the little island. The inhabitants came to the help of the shipwrecked seafarers with cheerful sympathy. The first thing was to light a fire, for they were drenched to the skin, and the north-easter and the rain which followed increased their miseries. Paul himself helped gather brushwood to feed the fire. But as he was about to throw his faggot on the blaze, a viper crept out of it and fastened on his hand. In a moment the creature was flung into the flames. The natives, struck with terror, regarded Paul as a murderer, for he had only escaped the waves to fall an instant victim to justice; nor did they think better of him till they found no harm follow of it.

Near the scene of the shipwreck stood the villa of a certain Publius, who was deputy of Malta under the prætor of Sicily. This man hospitably entertained Paul, Aristarchus and Luke. The latter, himself a physician, states that the father of Publius was then ill of dysentery. Paul prayed for him, and cured him by the power of prayer—not the first time it had proved effectual. Other sick persons came in consequence of this event, and sought help from the strangers, who thus not only speedily found a new sphere of action, but met with such friendship and gratitude throughout the island that, when the time of departure drew near, the people gladly supplied them with every necessary, and let them go with regret. November, December and January, were passed on the island. The larger vessels riding in the har-

hour might now venture to undertake the voyage across to Sicily. The "Castor and Pollux" of Alexandria, laden with corn, whose punctual arrival was not a matter of indifference, brought the company safe and well to Messina, where they stayed three days. In two days more the travellers at length saw before them the Gulf of Naples and the longed-for port of Puteoli, the last before Rome. Every corn-ship, recognizable afar by her ensign, was welcomed at Puteoli by the cheers of the populace, especially if it arrived early in the year.[1]

At this point our prisoners were put on shore, to complete their journey on foot. But first they stayed awhile in the city, where the three Christians were fortunate in finding members of the local church, by whom Paul was hospitably received. They stayed with the brethren seven days; then the convoy proceeded on its way, now once more in strict military fashion. The road they followed was the far-famed Via Appia, which leads first through the smiling plains of Campania, then through the Pontine marshes. Owing to the malarious exhalations of these marshes, the better class of travellers used to leave the road at the temple of Feronia, and be conveyed by sturdy boatmen along the canal which followed the road as far as Forum Appii.[2] Our convoy marched on foot through the ill-famed marshes, thus described by Horace:

> "Our party thence to Forum Appii wins,
> Crammed full of sailors and extortionate inns;
> And here we stop, and break, as idlers can,
> A one day's journey for an active man:—
> To sluggards, Appii is less tiring far.
> The water here was vile, and made me war
> Upon my stomach; while the rest took food,
> I waited for them in no patient mood.
> Night wrapped the earth in darkness, heaven in stars,
> And slaves and boatmen joined in wordy wars:—

[1] Seneca, Ep. 77; Suet. Nero, 45.

[2] Cf. the commentators on Horace, Sat. i. 5, where there is a lively description of this journey, but in the reverse direction.

'Ahoy! Put in there.' 'Full inside: avast!
We've got three hundred.'—A good hour goes past
In taking fares and harnessing the mule.
The cursed gnats and frogs that haunt the pool
Drive sleep away: the sailor, swilled in lees,
Outbawls the traveller with his love-ditties."[1]

This was the place where Paul was first met by some brethren of the Christian church of Rome, who had come out to meet him as far as the forty-third milestone. A few miles north of this, at Tres Tabernæ, were some more brethren, waiting to meet the prisoner of Christ with due honour. From this point the traveller is greeted by the solemn monuments of the Servilii, Metelli and Scipios, recalling the grandeur of Roman antiquity.[2] He draws nearer to the capital of the world, and welcomes the signs of the city:

"Fumum et opes strepitumque Romæ."

Passing the Porta Capena, from whose wet masonry the drippings from the Claudian aqueduct overhead fell in heavy drops upon the passers-by, Paul entered the capital. We find here in later days the chief settlement of the Jews; and perhaps the Apostle's following was composed of residents in the city:

"— at wet Capena's ancient arch,
Where Numa met his nightly visitant.
Now grove and shrine beside the holy well
Are leased to Jews, their household furniture
A hamper and some hay, for every tree
Pays tribute to the people, and the wood
Goes begging and the Muses are expelled."[3]

But the centurion Julius was bound for the barracks of the prætorians, lying on the other side of the city to the north-east, near the Viminal hill, on the *agger Tarquinii*. If the traditional text of the Acts is correct, the *præfectus prætorio*, Burrus, received the prisoners in person.[4] Paul was kept in *custodia libera*, that

[1] Sat. i. 5, 3—15. [2] Cic. Tusc. 1, 7. [3] Juven. Sat. iii. 10, seq.

[4] Besides, the position of the powerful Burrus, who governed an empire like that of Rome, Acts xxviii. 16, offers internal difficulties.

is to say, he and his guard were allowed to live in hired lodgings near the barracks.

---

2. The Jews in Rome.

For about a hundred years the Jewish quarter of Rome had been an inexhaustible object for the curiosity, scorn and disgust of the capital. The number of Jews in Rome was inconsiderable before the first Jewish war; but Pompey, Cassius and Antony sold a large number of Jewish prisoners into slavery, and most of them had come to the capital. But the purchasers were soon at their wits' end to know what to do with such wares. Kind words were as ineffectual as blows to make them live after the rules of a Gentile household. They would not touch the household meals; they would not work on the Sabbath, shrank from contact with the commonest things, while no power on earth could break their obstinacy. Though all did not go to such lengths as Josephus' imprisoned priests,[1] who lived on nothing but figs and nuts because they thought Roman cookery defilement from beginning to end, still all were certainly inconvenient to have in the house, and were given their liberty at a low price because their activity made them much more useful as *liberti*.[2]

Such was the origin of that community of Jewish freedmen at Rome, which used simply to be called the Libertines, and was soon to be considered one of the greatest curses of Roman life.[3] Such at least is Philo's account of the origin of the Jewish community at Rome: "Cæsar required no worship of his genius, and openly approved the Jews' abhorrence of such an act. Otherwise he would not have permitted a great part of the city beyond the river to be occupied by them, most of whom were freedmen; that is to say, who had been set free by their owners because

[1] Vita, 3. [2] Cic. Pro Flacco, 28; Bell. i. 11, 2; Apion, i. 7.
[3] Tac. Ann. ii. 85; Leg. ad Gai. ii. 568 M; Acts vi. 9.

they could not be forced to give up the customs of their fathers. He was well aware that they had their own places of prayer, where they assembled, especially on the Sabbath, according to the religion of their fathers. He knew, too, that they sent collections to Jerusalem under the name of first-fruits, as well as representatives to sacrifice for them."[1]

It was not unintentionally that the Jews and their peddling trades had been relegated to the fourteenth district, beyond the Tiber, to which all unclean occupations were banished.[2] Their quarter lay on the slopes of the Vatican, and extended over one of the low-lying islands exposed to the floods of the Tiber, where the boats ascending the river from Ostia used to touch. The landing-place for cargoes was the right spot for the Jewish brokers, who congregated there increasingly every year.[3] From various indications, their total numbers in the time of Augustus may be inferred as 40,000, in the time of Tiberius as not less than 60,000, if our rules of statistics apply.[4] It has been shown from inscriptions that Rome contained seven synagogues:[5] among them, a synagogue of Augustus, one of Agrippa, a *schola campi*, another of the Subura, a *synagoga Volumni*, and one "of the olive-tree."[6] Thus the most select portions of the city, such as the Campus Martius, were not free from Jews. We have heard already of another quarter of "Transtiberine" appearance by the Porta Capena, where Vespasian afterwards made them an express grant of the most frequented entrance to the Appian Way, so that one of the sacred spots of ancient Rome was turned into a bazaar of Jewish mendicants, to the great

[1] Leg. ad Gai. 568 M.

[2] Martial, i. 108: "A fine house, but beyond the Tiber;" vi. 93: "Stinking like the skin of a filthy dog from over the Tiber."

[3] Philo, Leg. Mang. 568: Frankf. ed. 1014; Martial, i. 41.

[4] Ant. xvii. 11, 1; Tac. Ann. ii. 85.

[5] Friedländer, Darstellung aus der Sittengeschichte Roms, iii. 510.

[6] In Schürer, Neutest. Ztg. 636, 37.

indignation of the stricter aristocracy. As the poet complains over the grotto and pool of Egeria:

> "— but ah! much lovelier
> If the stream's godlike force were unconfined
> By the green margent of the shaven lawn,
> Nor marble all replaced the natural tuff:"

so he is incensed to see the Jew perform his required ablutions at the outfall of the sacred spring of Egeria, and the sacred grove desecrated by pedlars and beggars. At night, men and women went back to the Porta Flumentana and the Pons Judaicus, or even, as the "hamper and hay" implies, slept in the open like gipsies.[1] At earliest dawn the cry of the Jewish pedlar breaks in on the slumbers of the indolent Martial:

> "Sparsus, there's not a corner left in town
> For a poor fellow to get rest or thought.
> For up and down they go and know no stop,
> Jew beggars whom their mothers taught to beg,
> And blear-eyed hawkers of their sulphury wares."[2]

Juvenal, too, going to his window, espies the Jewess betimes enter the boudoir of luxurious ladies, to interpret their dreams to their guilty hearts:

> "The Jewess leaves her basket and her hay,
> And trembling pours her plaint in secret ears;
> Expounder she of Solymæan lore,
> The mighty priestess of the grove; nay, more,
> High heaven's interpreter infallible.
> Her hand is filled, but sparingly; the Jew
> Will sell you cheap the vision of your choice."[3]

Similarly the best representative of the most unrelieved poverty is,

> "The pedlar from beyond the Tiber's stream
> Hawking his sulphur-sticks for broken glass."[4]

The Jews' bridge and beggars' bridge are the last resting-places

[1] Juv. Sat. iii. 12, seq., 296, seq.
[2] Mart. xii. 57.
[3] Juv. vi. 541, seq.
[4] Mart. i. 42, 3.

of penury. Let him, cries Martial, who contemns the stole or purple,

> "Tramp the town far from bridge and hill,
> And, last of the hoarse beggar crew,
> Beg bread his shameless mouth to fill."[1]

At the same time the Jewish beggar's creed gave him entire freedom of action against the Gentiles. He considers it laudable to pilfer from the temples; the very helmet of Mars Ultor was not safe from his thievish fingers.[2]

But bad as the poor Jew was, the historians considered the rich Jew a still greater burden, especially if emancipated from tradition. To the disgust of the Roman world, Jewish parvenus by no means confined themselves to trade; no walk of life was now secure from their competition. High and low, from Josephus, the favourite of the Flavii, living in the palace on the Septizonium, down to the beggar-woman by the Porta Capena, one and all profited by their Orientalism so alien to the capital, and exploited to the full the Romans' awe of the gods and mystical scriptures of the East. Yet, on the other hand, they easily adapted themselves to the customs of the capital, and discovered an incredible capacity for any and every pursuit. What, indeed, had the Israelites not turned their hand to? Merchants and money-changers, shopkeepers and pedlars, these they were everywhere;[3] but they were also officials and sometimes even soldiers;[4] they were scholars,[5] poets,[6] editors,[7] and, in Nero's artistic days, even actors[8] and singers.[9] They swore by the temple of the Thunderer,[10] and charmed the court by their declamation of the tragic trimeter in mythological parts.[11] These emancipated Jews liked to try all the customs of the Gentiles. Regardless of Gentile scorn, they forced their way into the public baths, and with characteristic pertinacity secured the best seats, doubly

[1] Mart. x. 5, 3; Juven. iv. 116, v. 8, xiv. 134.
[2] Rom. ii. 22, and Juv. xiv. 260.
[3] Mart. xii. 57.
[4] Ant. xx. 5, 2.
[5] Josephus.
[6] Mart. xi. 94.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Jos. Vita, 3.
[9] Mart. vii. 82.
[10] Mart. xi. 94.
[11] Jos. Vita, 3.

absurd if they wished to conceal their Jewish origin.[1] They were successful rivals of the wanton youth of Rome in all the haunts of wantonness;[2] in brief, there was no place so holy—or so profane—as to be free from Jewish invasion. With all this there went great adroitness; in literature, particularly, the more deliberate Roman was astounded at the talent for plagiarism, re-casting and editing, developed by the Jewish literati, whom nevertheless it did not prevent from enjoying every pleasure, permitted or forbidden, as much as the indolent citizens of the capital. Martial gives a true portrait of them in his lines:

"For your envy and detraction
I demand no satisfaction,
For you know a thing a thing or two,
Poetic Jew.

"Nor, Jew, while you criticise,
Care I that you plagiarise;
It shows you know a thing or two,
Poetic Jew.

"But I feel it, son of Shem,
True-born of Jerusalem,
When you steal my lover, too,
Poetic Jew.

"You deny it? I'll not take
The oath by Tonans' shrine you make.
Anchialus alone will do,
Poetic Jew."[3]

The language employed by the Roman Jews was Greek, Paul too writing in Greek to the Christian Church at Rome. The inscriptions in the three Jewish cemeteries—one across the Tiber, another beside the Appian Way near the Porta Capena, and the third in the catacombs—are mostly in Hebraistic Greek, less often in bad Latin, and never in Hebrew.[4] Their language in the capital was therefore the Judæo-Greek jargon of Asia Minor,

[1] Mart. vii. 82. [2] Mart. xi. 94, vii. 30.

[3] Mart. xi. 94. "Anchialus" is a name of contempt for the Jewish God, formed from Exod. xx. 2 (Anokhi Eloah). Cf. Ewald, Hist. Isr. vii. 27.

[4] Cf. Friedländer, Aus der Sittengesch. Roms, iii. 510, seq.

and Martial seizes the opportunity of making merry even over the speech of literary Jews.

But the allusions of Roman authors chiefly express the Roman's great abhorrence for the customs peculiar to Jewish life. Circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath, the prohibition of swine's flesh, were inexhaustible subjects for Roman jeers.[1] Where the Jew ventured to make his prayers and ablutions in public, he was certain of insult; but Roman mockery had gone further, spying in at the windows of Jewish houses, and marking how the head of the house lit the candles on the eve of the Sabbath, spread his table and offered prayer.[2] Persius goes contemptuously through the angular byways of the Ghetto, where dim lamps, wreathed with violets, flicker above the doors; within he sees pale lips murmuring in prayer. Even their Thursday fast and nightly ablutions did not escape Horace.[3] There was no situation, in short, in which the deep repugnance planted by Nature between the Semite and the Latin, did not reveal itself. The Jew was the butt of literary wit, the object of open attack in the theatre, and therefore subjected to brutal ill-treatment in ordinary life. The well-known joke, "Quid Judæo cum Verre," was not too cheap for Cicero, nor the "Curtis oppedere Judæis" too low for Horace. Turning to a Jewish authority, we find Rabbi Abahu pointedly complain what a small show of wit was necessary to raise a laugh in the theatre if only it contained a hit at the Jews.[4] A camel is brought on the stage, dressed in the garb of mourning. Then follows this dialogue: "Why is the camel in mourning?" "Because the Jews are keeping their Sabbath, and eat no green stuff, but only feed on thistles. The camel is in mourning because he is robbed of his food." Enter Momus (Pantaloon) with his head shaved. "Why is Momus in mourning?" "Because oil is so dear." "Why is oil so dear?" "Because of the Jews. Everything

[1] Cf. Time of Jesus, Vol. i. p. 175, seq. (Eng. trans.).

[2] Persius, 5, 180. [3] Sat. ii. 3, 288, seq.

[4] Cf. Grätz, iv. 353, from the Introduction to Midrash Threni.

they earn on week-days they consume on the Sabbath; they have not even wood left to cook their dinner by, so they are forced to burn their beds. When they have got no beds, they have to sleep on the ground and roll in the dust; to get rid of the dirt, they use a shocking amount of oil, and that is why oil is so dear and Momus has gone into mourning."

Buffoonery of this sort was but the foam tossed up by a tempest that stirred the ocean to its depths. To men of more serious temper, Judaism seemed no jest, but a most formidable enemy to classical culture. The persecutions of Christians and Jews under Nero were duly calculated to meet a desire long latent in the hearts of the Roman townspeople, and well known to a chief of police like Tigellinus. The Jews of Rome, then, were in a state of oppression only endurable by a nation so mobile and elastic. But they repaid this contempt and brutality ten times over by their adroitness in taking advantage of the people. In spite of its beggarly appearance, the Jewish quarter beside the Tiber was far from the least important among the districts of Rome. The great people of this hostile city and the small were entered upon the Jews' account-books with great and small figures respectively.[1] Through their connection with all the Dispersion of the empire, the Jews were well-informed in public matters, and therefore were early regarded as a considerable factor in the life of the capital, although they never reached such a degree of prosperity as the Jews of Alexandria or Antioch.

As early as the time of Pompey, the Jews used occasionally to make noisy demonstrations on behalf of their privileges. During the trial of Flaccus in 59, Cicero saw them in such numbers among the assembled citizens, that he lowered his voice so as to be heard by the judges alone, and thus to deprive the Jews of any occasion for uproarious interruptions. Indeed, he considered it a proof of great personal courage to appear against this tumultuous and irreconcilable tribe.[2] There was less danger

[1] Jos. Ant. xviii. 6, 1, seq.

[2] Pro Flacco, 28.

in the demonstration made by the Jews in 44 at the death of Cæsar, who had lavished such lucrative privileges upon them. Night after night the whole Jewish quarter gathered round the ashes of the Imperator's pyre, raising the mournful chants of their own funeral rites. Their Hebrew psalms kept alive the impression made on every mind by the speech of Antony.[1] Nor did the despotism of Augustus set any limit to the noisy performances of the Jews. In the year of Herod's death, 8000 Jews appeared before the monarch in support of a petition from Jerusalem for the restoration of a theocratic constitution;[2] and the square before the temple of Apollo on the Palatine witnessed a vast popular gathering of the Jews.

The Jews were as tumultuous and factious in their party struggles within their own quarter as when they made common cause against the Roman government. From time to time the inhabitants of the capital saw with the utmost delight a storm of theological debate sweep through the Jewish quarter, while the detested nation quarrelled and rioted, flung dust, and even proceeded to violence against one another. The tumult sometimes reached such a pitch that the prætor expelled multitudes *en bloc*.[3] The Jews' turbulent method of settling theological controversy had indeed become proverbial; Horace concludes his discussion of an æsthetic controversy with the mocking threat:

> "— should you not agree,
> Behold a host of poets, all for me.
> Numbers are with us; join us if you choose;
> If not, we'll force you to it, like the Jews."[4]

The Jews, then, could not reckon on a favourable hearing in their endeavours to proselytize. But it is only after sounding all the depths of the feeling against them that we can estimate the pre-eminence of the religious genius of the Jews, who nevertheless succeeded in gaining many proselytes in Rome itself.

[1] Suet. Cæs. 84.
[2] Bell. ii. 6, 1.
[3] Suet. Claud. 25.
[4] Sat. i. 4, 140, seq.

The tombstones in the Jewish cemeteries show that Judaism touched the highest circles. A considerable church of proselytes had gathered about the various synagogues. Women predominated; and among them were representatives of many famous names, daughters of the Fulvian, Flavian, Valerian, Veturian and other *gentes*. Poppæa herself was received into a synagogue with such sincerity that she left orders to be buried as a Jewess, and Nero in consequence shocked the aristocracy by placing a Jewish coffin, instead of the usual cinerary urn, in the tomb of the Julii.[1]

Another tombstone tells of a Roman lady, known in the world as Paula Veturia, who was called Sara in the church, and came over to the synagogue with all her slaves. Seventy-six years of age at her conversion, she lived sixteen years longer in the synagogue, an attractive instance of the righteous, according to the promise of Israel, living long in the land which the Lord their God giveth them.[2]

Thus the Jewish propaganda had cast its meshes about every stratum of society, and it was not without reason that the bitterest complaints of Jewish proselytism came from the literature of the capital. It was chiefly the burden of sin, as with Poppæa, or a troubled conscience, terrified by oppressive dreams, that drove men and women to seek comfort and salvation in Israel,[3] but superstition also found great attractions in the Mosaic ritual. The number of the proselytes is proved by witticisms on Jewish tendencies being current among the wits of Rome. Ovid finds the "friends of the Jews" agreeable, and the synagogue convenient.[4] Juvenal's Umbricius declares he was met in the street with the question, "Where in the house of prayer shall I find thee, Jew?" And long before him, Aristius Fuscus in Horace

[1] Tac. Ann. xvi. 6. Corpus non igitur abolitum sed regum externorum consuetudine differtum odoribus conditur tumuloque Juliorum infertur. It cannot have been an Egyptian mode of burial, for there were no Egyptian kings. The Herods are probably meant. Ant. xiv. 7, 4; John xix. 40.

[2] Cf. Grätz, iv. 123. [3] Juv. vi. 544. [4] Ars. Amat. i. 36.

says he is "one of the many" in professing to keep the long day.[1] Thursdays' fasts, Sabbath closing of shops, scruples about food and pilgrimages to Jerusalem, prevail in many circles;[2] and even where the customs are not established, the Jewish belief in the approach of a universal catastrophe gains ground rapidly.

Soon, however, those who had become deeply involved with the synagogue were observed to show complete indifference to the interests of the empire and even of their families. "They despise the gods, renounce their country, set at nought parents, children and kindred," says Tacitus. Juvenal describes the life of a proselyte family with deep indignation. In his eyes, the Jew is a man who would eat human flesh sooner than pork, who adores the blue sky instead of any God, who is circumcised, who contemns the laws of Rome and teaches his children to contemn them, and in their place learns by heart the bulky volume of Moses' sacred law, observing these ordinances and worshipping them. In the wilderness he refuses to show the way or point out a well to any but one of his own faith; he sits idle on the seventh day, and brings up his children in the same habit of idleness.[3] Such being the conception of Judaism, it was natural that men were not satisfied with simple literary criticism; the bitter earnest of the Claudian edicts made the Jew feel the aversion to which he would otherwise have been indifferent.

To pass over earlier conflicts, the ground was now prepared for the great expulsion of the Jews in 53, already mentioned. But after the death of Claudius these burdensome guests were recalled all too soon, if indeed the banishment was ever com-

[1] "— memini bene, sed meliore
Tempore dicam; hodie tricesima sabbata: vin tu
Curtis Judæis oppedere? Nulla mihi, inquam,
Religio est. At mi: sum paullo infirmior, unus
Multorum. Ignosces; alias loquer."—Sat. i. 9, 68, seqq.

[2] Juv. xiv. 95, seq.; Hor. Sat. ii. 3, 288, seq.; i. 5, 100; 9, 20; Suet. Aug. 93.

[3] Juv. Sat. xv. 96—106.

pletely carried out, and now a Christian church had come into existence amongst them.

---

3. The Roman Christians.

A colony that settles down in a foreign country solely for purposes of gain, in spite of patriotic and religious reasons against such a settlement, inevitably rouses some prejudice against itself. Yet a collection of twenty or thirty thousand souls, like that of the Roman Jews, always contains grave elements which command respect, such as are here betokened by the zeal with which religious questions were treated. One result of this vigour in theological controversy was the church of Jewish Christians, into which Paul now entered so far as his imprisonment permitted. The Nazarene party, with the quickness distinctive of the Roman Jew, heard of Paul's arrival at Naples, and went out nearly forty miles to meet him, a full day's journey. Nevertheless, it is clear from the Pauline Epistles written in Rome that the Apostle's relations with the Christianized Jews were soon disturbed. A closer examination of the character of the church shows this to have been inevitable. Reading between the lines of the Epistle to the Romans, we find this church dominated by a restless spirit of asceticism. And no wonder, for it was recruited from men of deep religious feeling, not from the indifference of the trading community; and men of deep religious feeling were chiefly to be found amongst the Essenes and Pharisees. Isolated in the howling wilderness of Rome, and horrified at the results of the life after the flesh, the pious Jews drew together first in the synagogue, and afterwards in the church of Christ.

Thus the church at Rome contained a number of ascetics who would simply be called Essenes if they were not Christians

The Epistle to the Romans speaks of members of the church who were like the Rechabites in drinking neither wine nor any other intoxicant, and in eating nothing that had lived or would come to life; who therefore refused to touch eggs or fish or flesh, but lived solely on vegetables.[1] Celibacy, it need scarcely be added, was another principle of these ascetics; while they were very particular about the proper days for fasting, and the due scope and proper observance of the numerous festivals in the Jewish calendar.[2] An extreme tendency of this kind was certain to be a facile cause of disturbance in the church; and Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, is thinking particularly of these men, and their intolerable habit of prying about to discover some stumbling-block.

Thus there was as little peace in the Christian as in the orthodox Jewish synagogue. In the year 58, Paul fears that the good of the church will be of ill repute among the Gentiles when they see how the Essenes and ascetics among the Jewish Christians attack and rend one another. Here, as elsewhere, the parties alternately crushed freedom of conscience, so that now the man without scruples fasted hypocritically, and now the man of scruple ate while his conscience reproached him.[3] As at Corinth, the life of the church was passing through a crisis. No fixed church ordinances had yet been developed; there was no regular government. The consequence was that the church was at the mercy of the truly Jewish desire to split up into separate groups upon questions of degree, while agreeing in maintenance of the law.[4]

Still, in spite of these shades of difference, the church as a whole is decidedly of a Jewish stamp, and Paul in his time finds some difficulty in writing to them.[5] In his Epistle he constantly considers their prejudices in his thoroughly Old Testament conception of Jesus as the son of David,[6] and his

[1] Rom. xiv. 2, 16.
[2] Rom. xiv. 5, seq.
[3] Rom. xiv. 14.
[4] Rom. xiv. 1.
[5] Rom. i. 12.
[6] Rom. i. 3.

bitter lament over the threatened loss of Israel to the new kingdom.[1] Paul, indeed, was so well aware of the opposition to him through these very prejudices in the church, that he had written to them before, explaining in the strongest terms that he was no enemy of his people, and had no intention of taking the children's bread and throwing it to the dogs. "I say the truth," he wrote in his Epistle to the Romans; "I lie not, my conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy Ghost, that I have great sorrow and unceasing pain in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites, whose is the adoption and the glory and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all."[2] Kind and gentle as none other, he laid his case before the church, calmed their fears, allayed their prejudices, and finally let them see into a corner of his heart where lay his secret sorrow over the fate of his people.

But he gained little by it. When they had once satisfied their love of novelty and done enough for form's sake, they left him to himself. Not a soul supported him in his first trial, as if his affair was no concern of the Christians.[3] Another consideration is the political excitement prevailing among Jews and Christians alike. The state of Palestine naturally affected the Jews of Rome. They must have been exasperated by the ruthless blows which Festus dealt the patriots, and his long lines of crucifixions. While the young Josephus, fresh from his shipwreck, agitated in the antechamber and boudoir of Poppæa, the Jews of the capital were filled with chimerical hopes, which were shared by the Christians,[4] and in true Jewish fashion were so loudly expressed that they may have been a reason for ascribing the great fires which soon after broke out in the neighbourhood of the Circus Maximus, to the handiwork of the Orientals.

[1] Rom. ix. 10, 11.
[2] Rom. ix. 1, seq.
[3] 2 Tim. iv. 16.
[4] Phil. iii. 18—21.

Those who lived in the capital, with Nero's orgies and the misery of court and senate before their eyes, may well have under-estimated the power of resistance left to the empire. Jewish sources, of course, offer no first-hand evidence of this temper, for the Prophecy of Moses and the fourth book of Ezra are later works. But it need scarcely be said that on the eve of the Jewish war there was the same feeling among the Jews of Palestine and of the Trastevere. The Romans' precise knowledge of Jewish expectations can scarcely have been obtained except from the conduct of the Jews. Certain it is that, in the year 58, Paul presupposes a spirit of disorder and discontent even among the Christian Jews. The church supports all the views of Judas the Gaulonite, that the Israelite owns no lord but God, that he owes tribute to no idolatrous state, and even in his outward carriage should let the Gentiles feel that there was blood between his people and their people. Repugnance to the abominations of the Roman Sodom, and certainty of the nearness of the end, might well make the champions of God advance with redoubled insistence. Paul, at all events, spoke vigorously against this movement, which was to bring such murderous consequences upon the Church in the year 64. The fanatic refuses the oath to Cæsar at the customary act of homage on the Calends of January, because it is not for the son of Israel to have any lord but Jehovah, or passes the prætor's fasces and the laticlave with unbending neck; Paul utters a word of warning: "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God, and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment."[1]

These statements are in direct opposition to the theories of the Zealots, with which the Apostle was well acquainted. To pay homage to Cæsar is not to honour the devil, but God, without whose will there would be no powers. The same reasoning

[1] Rom. xiii. 1.

solves the question whether it be lawful to pay tribute to the emperor. The taxpayer does not contribute to the service of devils; but the officials are God's "ministers," who manage a sacred business.[1] The Gaulonite refused tolls because they defiled the goods, and taxes because they involved the forbidden numbering of the people, and homage because it acknowledged the genius of Cæsar; Paul, on the contrary, commanded: "Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due: custom to whom custom: fear to whom fear: honour to whom honour: for power is a minister of God to thee for good."[2]

The patriot holds up to him the rivers of blood poured out in Palestine when Felix fought daily with the bands of assassins; Paul replied: "Power beareth not the sword in vain, for it is a minister of God, an avenger of wrath to him that doeth evil. And wouldest thou have no fear of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise for the same."[3]

The Apostle was thus severed from the Jewish Christians of Rome by the same gulf which once severed Jesus from the leaders of his people. It can be easily understood that the Apostle's feelings towards this popular outburst cooled after his last experiences at Jerusalem, his perils from the daggers of the assassins, his long months in the castle-yard at Cæsarea, where it was whispered on every side of him, "Touch not, taste not, handle not," and murderers sometimes were honoured as patriots. Yet the relative rights of the other side are not to be overlooked. Though Paul might say, "Rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil," the persecuted church of Rome had had other experiences. A saying like this sounded specially ironical at the present juncture, in the Rome of Nero and Tigellinus. After his very different experience of constant persecution from the Jews and protection in general from the authorities, Paul could not come to an understanding with the Roman church, who had fallen out with the Gentile government from the very first. The sense of opposition had already appeared throughout

[1] Rom. xiii. 6. [2] Rom. xiii. 7. [3] Rom. xiii. 3, 4.

the Epistle to the Romans; and now was Paul's opportunity for a personal application of all the generous ideas he had before developed to the church in theory. This case, however, was no exception to the rule that religious differences are embittered rather than allayed by personal intercourse. The prisoner stands alone and deserted in the midst of Christians excited by political dreams of a Messiah; he reproaches them with being puffed up with earthly expectations and selfish aims, and with not merely giving him up, but adding torture to his bondage by their rejection.

Considering the embittered view of Roman Judaism, it cannot be wondered that Paul feels isolated in the midst of a church moved by fanatical thoughts of turbulence, and laments his isolation bitterly;[1] that he charges the leaders of the church with preaching merely from factiousness and not with pure aims;[2] with hoping for an earthly revolution, and dreaming of a polity to be established on earth, in Palestine.[3] This was but the confirmation of the censures more mildly expressed at a distance in the Epistle to the Romans. Considering, further, that the laws about meats create such difficulties, that it is so important whether one lives on vegetable or flesh, on water or wine, and that the appeal for tolerance was fruitless, the Apostle was justified in his indignation, saying that to such persons their belly is really their god.[4] Considering, again, that the most complete discussions of the meaning of circumcision still failed to settle the thorny question, one can understand an excitable man like Paul casting it in their teeth that they sought their glory in their shame.[5] In the glow of wrath, he gives the name of refuse[6] to everything on which they prided themselves—descent from the patriarch Israel, from the tribes which remained faithful, from a Hebrew house and from the true school—and showers on them epithets such as "dogs, evil-workers, circumcision in the flesh."[7] Their

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 16. [2] Phil. i. 15. [3] Phil. iii. 18, seq.
[4] Phil. iii. 19. [5] Ibid. [6] Phil. iii. 8.
[7] Phil. iii. 2.

reply naturally corresponded to his warmth; and so he finally receives the impression that they are his worst opponents, deliberately bent upon making his captivity more irksome.[1] This is intelligible from the utter antagonism between their respective ideas and the violence of Jewish religious combats. Paul himself clearly expresses the difference between the Jewish Christians of Rome and the ideas of his own school, by saying that the former turn their minds to earthly things, whereas the city of the true Christian is in heaven, from whence Christians expect the coming of the Saviour who shall transform all earthly things, so that there will be no more Palestine nor Jerusalem, nor body nor circumcision, according to the heavenly power whereby Christ is able to make all things subject to himself.

We learn the course of these last struggles with the Jewish Christians from three short epistles which can be recovered from the existing Second Epistle to Timothy and that to the Philippians, which is a combination of two Pauline epistles.[2]

[1] Phil. i. 15, seq.

[2] The genuine basis of 2 Tim., in which a later writer endeavours to recommend sound principles of church discipline by the mouth of Paul, is a short letter addressed to Timothy from prison at Rome, and consists of the salutation, elsewhere interpolated, of verses 15—18 and iv. 9—18. The existence of this fragment presumably first suggested the composition of "Pastoral letters" in the name of the Apostle. The short letter touches off the Apostle's situation at Rome with a firm hand, and is stamped throughout by the Pauline mode of expression. More is to be got from the Epistle to the Philippians; but this, too, was not written as we have it. It really consists of two letters written from prison in Rome, the earlier going to make chapters iii. and iv., the later i. and ii. of the present Epistle. For the Apostle starts anew in the middle of iii. 1, as if he were putting pen to paper for the first time: "To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not irksome, but for you it is safe." This is not followed by the slightest repetition of the same things; on the contrary, the tone changes to one of irritability quite out of keeping with the gentle tone of the first half. Now, too, we notice that the whole passage, from ii. 19 on, sounds like a farewell, and contains personal dispositions such as Paul only makes at the end of a letter, down to the regular concluding phrase: "Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord." Now since the introduction to chap. iii. presupposes previous letters of Paul to the Philippians, and Polycarp in the next cen-

It appears, in the first place, from these records that the Apostle's case had assumed a most serious aspect by the transfer to Rome. In Cæsarea, Paul was a Roman citizen accidentally arrested, who had been torn from the hands of the Jews by Roman troops; in Rome, he was one of the prisoners from rebellious Judæa, to suppress which the strictest measures required to be taken on every point. The prætor seems to have had the usual phrase, "Ad leonem," on his lips,[1] but this time Paul was delivered from the lions. But the short note to Timothy, in which he bids him and Mark come, bears the unmistakable traces of mental depression. Paul recounts the loss of all his friends since the parting with Timothy in Cæsarea. Of Rome he only says briefly: "Alexander the copper-smith did me much evil: the Lord will render to him according to his works: of whom be thou ware also: for he greatly withstood our words. At my first defence no one took my part, but all forsook me: may it not be laid to their account. But the Lord stood by me and strengthened me; that through me the message might be fully proclaimed, and that all the Gentiles might hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. The Lord will deliver me from every evil work, and will save me unto his heavenly kingdom; to whom be the glory for ever and ever."

It may be asked, What is the explanation of this unfriendly attitude of the Christian brethren, so utterly opposed to their

tury was acquainted with "Epistles" of Paul to the Philippians (Polyc. Phil. 3), we must suppose that the disparate halves of the Epistle were originally two Epistles, combined into one by a later hand. At the same time, chaps. iii. and iv. in manner and matter go closely with the short letter to Timothy, with which they thoroughly agree in their description of the situation, save that the private letter gives the names of the adversaries and describes the evil in so many words, while the letter to the church is content with general references. Both were written early in the year a few weeks after his arrival, one after his first trial, the other after receiving the gift of money from the Philippians (cf. 2 Tim. iv. 16, and Phil. iv. 10); while Phil. i. and ii. were conveyed by Epaphras on his way home after a long illness.

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 17.

first reception of Paul? The answer comes from Phil. iii and iv. The latent opposition of principles with regard to the law soon disclosed itself: the troubled waters were lashed to fury. It seems, from the Epistle to Timothy, that Jewish Christians from Ephesus again made their appearance and egged on the people against Paul. In particular we hear that the copper-smith Alexander, who has been named before, gave the Apostle great trouble, and two other Ephesians, Phygellus and Hermogenes, of whom Paul expected better things, joined in the attack. Paul was proportionately affected by the fidelity of another Ephesian, Onesiphorus, who came to Rome and searched the vast city from end to end till he found Paul at last, and, far from being ashamed of his bonds, brought him every alleviation in his power.[1]

Far different from this true brotherly love is the conduct of many other brethren, who found nothing better to do than to reiterate to the old man in captivity the everlasting theme of the Jewish law and the seed of Abraham, forcing from him once more the oft-repeated defence, which he briefly sums up to the Philippians with an eagerness to have done with it bred of satiety: "If any other man thinketh to have confidence in the flesh, I yet more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless. Howbeit what things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ." "Not that I have already attained, or am already made perfect: but I press on, if so be that I may apprehend. But one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal, unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

Assuredly Paul did not pour out his heart to the Philippians without provocation. The friendship of the Philippians sent a gleam of light into his life, as so often before in days of gloom.

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 16, i. 15, iv. 14.

They had learned the position in which he was; and as they had hastened to help him in former times of need, so now they again got together a considerable sum and sent it over by Epaphroditus. Frugal as the Apostle was, and well acquainted, as he says, with want and with abundance, he was cheered at this juncture by the token of remembrance, particularly as he had again and again regretted the absence of any token from abroad.[1] It put additional warmth into his thanks to the faithful church, which was itself in considerable distress, and found it no easy matter to make so great an effort on his behalf.[2]

His joy, however, was troubled by news of the intrigues of the Jewish party, who advanced further and further, and now were delighted to have sown the seeds of discord and division in Philippi. He hears with sorrow that even the first disciples he made among the women on the banks of the Gangas, who used to work with him in sisterly union, are now divided on the question which persecutes him everywhere. He commends them to the exhortation of the elders, who still survive from those days. "I exhort Euodia, and I exhort Syntyche, to be of the same mind in the Lord. Yea, I beseech thee also, true Syzygus, help these women, for they laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and the rest of my fellow-workers, whose names are in the book of life."[3] It is the old trouble repeating itself, the same unsolved problems; the Apostle can but account for the division by the hope: "The Lord is at hand. In nothing be anxious; but in everything, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus."

Still the Apostle does not take leave of us with these gloomy words of resignation. In the first chapters of the Epistle to the Philippians we have a final letter, dating perhaps a few months later, and showing that many things had taken a more friendly turn in the course of time. The occasion of the letter

[1] Phil. iv. 10. [2] Ibid. [3] Phil. iv. 2, 3.

was the return of Epaphroditus, who had intended to stay with Paul, but had almost fallen a victim to the treacherous climate of Rome in the summer. On this, Paul sent him home again, the more readily because he knew that his friends desired his return.[1] Timothy, too, who had hurried over from Ephesus, he wished to send away to quell the disturbances in Macedonia as soon as he should be able to do without his filial services, and see in some degree how things were likely to go with himself. For his own part, indeed, he promises to follow him to Philippi if he is set free, such is his interest there, and such his gratitude to the Philippians.

Light, then, dawns once more on the Apostle; and he makes new plans for the future. But he has gained a new interest in the present. The Philippians in their letter expressed a fear lest the gospel should be checked by his imprisonment. Far from this, the strength of the vital force in him was shown by the fact that he struck root and put forth new branches in this barren spot. He was able to interest in his ideas even the prætorians who took it in turn to guard him, as well as the rest, i.e. the tipstaves, gaolers, and other petty officials. It was felt throughout the barracks that Paul was not merely a prisoner like the rest, but bore his bonds for Christ's sake. The immediate vicinity of the Apostle is dominated by the same interest in Christianity which filled the whole city and was to be manifested a few months later in Nero's sanguinary persecutions of the Christians. Already it requires courage not to be ashamed of his bonds, like Onesiphorus, or to stay beside him, like Epaphras. He is deserted by all the enemies of the cross of Christ, i.e. of martyrdom. But his successes, obtained under circumstances so remarkable, have an effect on others. Certain brethren gain confidence through his bondage, seeing that the gospel is no outward seeming, put on or put off as suited the moment, but a power of God which upholds its Apostle even in fetters and in peril of his life. Emboldened by his heroic example, they ven-

[1] Phil. ii. 25.

ture to preach the word with greater confidence, though destined to meet with so fearful a response.

Yet his judgment of men's personal worth is unaltered by this. He says plainly to the Philippians that none of the Romans can now take the place of Timothy, who had meanwhile arrived, "for I have no man like-minded. For they all seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ."[1] Even their agitations on behalf of the gospel, and the undeniable fact that the attention of the capital is being attracted to the cause of Christ — nay, that the tidings of the coming Messiah finds adherents in the very palace of Nero[2]—he ascribes to aims of very various character. Some make Jesus known by taking occasion of Paul's presence to be zealous for the law, and find it convenient to add to the discomforts of his bondage by denying him, as though he had nothing to do with them. Others preach from love of him, because they honour his sacrifice and have his cause at heart. Yet he is satisfied that on the whole the name of Jesus gets known among the people through these controversies. Those who hear will look into it further, so that, after all, this controversial preaching is as good as the silent preaching of his bondage—"only that in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."[3]

A certain resignation underlies these words, such as we are not accustomed to in the author of the Epistle to the Galatians and the second Corinthians. But resignation is the general characteristic of these last writings, wherein his moods are strangely mingled. Prepared for martyrdom, he yet hopes that death will deliver him before sentence is pronounced; expecting the worst, he hopes nevertheless to see his friends again before long. It is touching to see how his thoughts waver. "But I am in a strait betwixt the two, having the desire to depart and be with Christ; for it is very far better; yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sake. And having

[1] Phil. ii. 20. [2] Phil. iv. 22. [3] Phil. i. 18.

this confidence, I know that I shall abide, yea, and abide with you all, for your progress and joy in the faith." But he is confronted at once with the thought of death, "whether he should by any means attain unto the resurrection of the dead." His mood is at once gentle and weary; though he occasionally lets fall an ejaculation of impatience with those who regard what they have before them instead of Christ, and seek themselves instead of their Lord. This mood, finally, is made natural to him by the prospect of martyrdom, which reveals itself more and more clearly in spite of all efforts to hope,—the prospect that immediately, it may be, his blood will be "poured out as a drink-offering to the glory of God upon the sacrifice and service of your faith." Indeed, the present situation at Rome was such that the requirements of the circus made it unlikely for a prisoner like Paul to be delivered "from the jaws of the lion."

---

4. Persecution of the Christians under Nero.

The moment of Paul's entry into Rome, early in 62, is fixed upon by common consent of the Roman historians as the beginning of the worst period in the life of Nero. The year opened with the death of Burrus and the retirement of Seneca. The new prefect of the prætorians, Tigellinus, was Poppæa's tool, and inaugurated his office by pushing on the fictitious suit against Nero's wife Octavia, which removed the last obstacles that prevented the courtesan from becoming empress. These changes had long since been prefigured by the execution of the mainstays of the opposition, a precedent which now opened a rich field for violence. Rome almost came to know the sufferings of Judæa in her own case. The people wavered to and fro between mad outbursts of turbulence and the fear of tyranny. In the open league between court and mob, the better classes of society were left unprotected. Philosophers turned their desires

upon remote estates, and praised the wisdom of nature for leaving the possibility of suicide. Believers thought the gods had departed, or taught the immediate end of the world. While fear of the Parthians penetrated the empire from end to end after Pætus' unparalleled defeat in the spring of 62, Nero contended with senators and shameless women in the arts of the circus. The emperor of the world sought the plaudits of the multitude as a singer, a charioteer, an actor, even in women's parts. There was no crime he did not openly commit. Tacitus tells us, in Ann. xv. 37, of a feast which Tigellinus, the prætorian prefect,[1] an adept in every crime, gave in Nero's honour on an artificial floating island in the lake of Agrippa, a feast which was so hideous a scene of prostitution and unspeakable shamelessness that it stirred indignation even in the Rome of that day. No wonder if the Christians were convinced that Antichrist had appeared, and Christ must be near at hand. We cannot tell how much of these unimaginable doings came to the ears of Paul; but what he did hear and see was so terrible, that the Christian churches in which he formerly found so much to blame, now seemed almost blamelessly pure "in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye are seen as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life."[2] That premonition of death, appearing in his words to the Philippians, now as hope and now as fear, had not deceived the Apostle; but the story of his individual fate is lost among the fearful catastrophes which now fell upon the capital and the Christian Church.[3]

On the night of July 18th, 64, a fire broke out in the booths by the Circus Maximus, which lay between the Palatine and the Cœlian. The wind carried the flames with incredible swiftness; and fire blazed forth continually in new quarters. As

[1] He soon pushed his colleague, Fenius Rufus, into the background. For Tigellinus, cf. Hist. i. 72; Annal. xiv. 51, 57; Dio Cass. xlii. 15; Juv. Sat. i. 155; Martial, iii. 20.

[2] Phil. ii. 15.

[3] Cf. Sievers, Studien zur Gesch. d. röm. Kaiser. 1870, p. 111.

the outbreak had taken place by night, at the hottest time of year, and in a place where innumerable booths of lath and canvas were crowded together and filled with vast quantities of inflammable goods,[1] the flames soon spread to a fearful extent. Running along the light material, a sea of fire soon encircled entire sections of this narrow and tortuous part of the city. Hundreds of people who had stayed too long in trying to save their goods, found their passage by the street cut off, and turning in the opposite direction, were as surely intercepted by the devouring flames. Elsewhere the wave of fire first swept over the level ground and then over the hills, pressing up on every side. The fury of the flames continuing day after day, all bonds of restraint were loosened, and there ensued every scene of horror inseparable from great fires. Thieves employed the universal confusion to ply their trade; there even appeared incendiaries who declared they acted upon orders from exalted quarters.

When the flames approached Nero's own palace and the gardens of Mæcenas, the emperor hurried back from Antium, and made fruitless efforts in person to check the destructive element. Popular fury designated him as the real incendiary; his most comprehensive efforts to shelter and provide for the homeless and starving people were unavailing to allay indignation. Some told with horror how the emperor stood watching the progress of the flames from the tower of Mæcenas, and in fantastic attire recited the "Fall of Troy." Others had heard him with their own ears talking of the "beauty of the flames," as if the fearful event were a fine spectacle on the stage.[2]

The fire was not checked till it reached the foot of the Esquiline on the sixth day. Every building had been pulled down for a long way round, so that the hungry tongues of flame found nothing to feed upon, and failed for want of fuel. But the fire broke out again mysteriously in the house of Tigellinus,

[1] Cf. Tac. Ann. xiv. 51, xv. 44; Dio Cass. lxii. 13, seq.

[2] Suet. Nero, 38.

and raged anew for three days and three nights. Not until this was extinguished was it possible to review the infinitude of damage. Of fourteen districts of the city, four remained. In seven districts there were left the wretched remnants of damaged and half-consumed houses. The other three were one vast heap of smoking rubbish. The most ancient temples and religious memorials were swept away: the number of those that were damaged was incalculable. An immense effect was produced by this event on the whole empire. No such disaster had befallen the capital since its capture by the Gauls. It was not difficult to prophesy that it would be rebuilt at the cost of the provinces; but the result on trade was fatal; and in Asia Minor the writer of the Apocalypse sees the merchants beside the harbour weeping and wailing over the burning of the city, which was a heavy blow to themselves.[1]

It cannot be supposed that this blow dealt at the heart of their deadly enemy was regretted by the Jews in their life-and-death struggle with Rome. On the contrary, it is clear from the Apocalypse that after the Jewish Christians had been forced to expiate the disaster to the city with their own blood, they were the more strongly inclined to regard the burning of Rome as a just punishment for the sins of the Gentiles. Although it was not true that the Christians had fired the city, as Nero's officials soon put it about, they nevertheless rejoiced at God's judgment upon the great Babylon whose sins cried out to heaven; and in 68 the author of the Apocalypse is still delighted with the scene presented by the harbour of Panormus at Ephesus when the news came of the burning of the capital. So shall it be once more at the last judgment: "The kings of the earth, who committed fornication and lived wantonly with her, shall weep and wail over her, when they shall look upon the smoke of her burning. And the merchants of the earth weep and mourn over her, for no man buyeth their merchandise any more. The merchants of these things, who were made rich by

[1] Rev. xviii. 15.

her, shall stand afar for fear of her torment, weeping and mourning, saying, Woe, woe, the great city, she that was arrayed in fine linen and purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stone and pearl! for in one hour is so great riches made desolate. And every shipmaster, and every one that saileth anywhither, and mariners, and as many as gain their living by sea, stood afar off, and cried out as they looked upon the smoke of her burning, saying, What city is like the great city? And they cast dust on their heads, and cried, weeping and mourning, saying, Woe, woe, the great city, wherein were made rich all that had their ships in the sea by reason of her costliness! for in one hour is she made desolate."[1]

Now different as was the impression left upon the provinces by this awful disaster, the sufferers in the capital, as always happens in such cases, demanded the authors of their misfortunes. While the populace were passionately intent upon this question, Nero came forward at once with a scheme for rebuilding, which was new and clever, but was abused as premature, and gave ground for the rumour that he himself had sacrificed the city to his senseless rage for architecture. How far there was any truth in this charge cannot be decided with any certainty.[2] It is possible that Nero proposed to get rid of the stalls and shops on the Circus, but the misfortune assumed greater proportions than he intended.[3] Possibly, again, it was simply his former mad excesses that excited the suspicions, which indeed sprang up at once.[4] The fact of the second outbreak occurring in the house of Tigellinus, gave peculiar confirmation to the report that Nero desired the glory of rebuilding

[1] Rev. xviii. 9—20.

[2] Cf. the detailed discussion in Schiller, Nero, p. 172, seq. and p. 425, seq.

[3] Tac. Ann. xv. 38.

[4] This, at all events, is Tacitus' view of the matter. That Josephus omits to record among Nero's iniquities a fact which provoked so much odium against the Jews, is only in keeping with his usual practice, and does not prove that he was unacquainted with the rumour.

the city and calling it after himself. The public temper growing more threatening every day, Tigellinus cast about for some means of clearing himself. His first idea was to pacify the mob by consulting the Sibylline Books, and ordering processions and religious rites. The anger of the people should be diverted by prayers to Vulcan, Ceres and Proserpine, by solemn processions to Juno on the Capitol, by pilgrimages to the sea, by mysteries of the matrons and sacrificial banquets. But "neither the bounty of the prince, nor propitiation of the gods, availed to stifle the rumour." Then the prefect resolved to gratify the people by a campaign against the incendiaries. The fire broke out in the booths along the Circus Maximus, some of which were in the hands of Oriental merchants.[1] Roman feeling towards the Jews being what it was, there was no difficulty in directing the popular fury against them. Another coincidence was that the Jewish quarter was one of those which escaped. Of the four unharmed, two were the low-lying districts of the Porta Capena (Regio I.) and Trans Tiberim (Regio XIV.), where the bulk of the Jews lived. This was most suspicious. Considering the patriotic excitement of the Ghetto, there can scarcely have failed to be manifestations of malicious joy, independently of sallies of religious fanaticism which only saw the beginning of long-foretold judgment in this dreadful catastrophe.

All this paved the way for an inquisition into the Jewish quarter. But it was plain that the responsibility could not lie with the whole Jewish population of from 20,000 to 30,000 souls. A beginning was therefore made with the section who were known to hope darkly for speedy judgment upon the Gentile world, and the followers of the coming Christ were first hunted down. Their hopes and aspirations must have become as notorious as they were detested, owing to the disturbances under Claudius. This course, at any rate, is signified in Tacitus' laconic statement, that the Christians were banished, not for

[1] Cf. Schiller, Nero, p. 434. [2] Ibid. p. 175.

the fire, but for their "universal hatred of the human kind." The only thing beyond their connection with Judaism that could give colour to such a charge was their view as to the immediate future of mankind. Their prophecies of judgments to come, of fire to fall from heaven and extirpate the Gentiles, of famines and droughts and earthquakes in divers places, were proof enough that this sect desired the downfall of the empire, and so Tigellinus declared that they had put their prophecies into practice by firing the city. The sting of the charge lay in the hatred of the Jews, which filled young and old, rich and poor.

But, on the one hand, it was impossible to deal with the Jews *en masse*, or to drive Judæa into rebellion by a general persecution; on the other, Poppæa's friendship to the Jews barred all action against them. It was, perhaps, the Jewish proclivities of the court that finally turned against the Christians, of whose crimes the populace had the wildest ideas to start with,[1] and whom even a man like Tacitus regarded as a "repulsive and contemptible offscouring" of Oriental immorality. By such winding ways the people discovered a scapegoat. They first attacked notorious adherents of the sect, who drew down others in their fall. For as in the Christian persecution in Palestine all were not found courageous, so here no few gave way under tortures, and countless arrests (*ingens multitudo*) filled the prisons on the information of men examined by the rack. At the end of the investigation, Tigellinus ingeniously made the execution of the prisoners a festival for the Roman mob. This human butcher displayed a refinement of barbarity in devising choice spectacles to make the executions less monotonous for the populace. As he only had to deal with *humiliores*, the most cruel punishments were permissible. The mildest treatment was in the case of those who were crucified in memory of the *auctor nominis, Christus*, in the Circus Vaticanus,[2] perhaps round

[1] Per flagitia invisi: Tac. Ann. xv. 44.

[2] Tac. Ann. xiv. 14; Plin. H. N. xxxvi. 11.

about the obelisk of Caligula, which to-day adorns the square of St. Peter, and at that time stood at the end of this circus.[1] Others were sewn up in the skins of animals and flung to the dogs at the *ludus matutinus* appointed for the wild-beast fight, while drums and cymbals relieved the spectators of the cries of agony. For these games the emperor threw open the gardens of Caligula, inherited from his mother, where once Gaius, as he paced up and down one of the walks, had the senators Papirius and Bassus beheaded, together with their wives and kindred, by torchlight.[2] But now the place witnessed scenes still more hideous. Those who were left from the games were dragged with hooks to the bank of the Tiber hard by, while Nero drove his chariot to and fro, showing himself to his people for the first time since the fire. When darkness fell, torches were lighted here and there. They were living Christians covered with tow and pitch, who, in the *tunica molesta*, were tied by the neck to a stake, and set alight. So Juvenal saw the martyrs

> "— blaze at the stake,
> And there impaled, and burning as they stand,
> Trace a broad furrow after in the sand."[3]

Further insults were added to their doom, epigrammatically put by Tacitus: *peruntibus addidit ludibria*. To get an idea of the atrocities of these *ludibria*, it is only necessary to read Suetonius' account of the buffooneries introduced by Nero, even including Pasiphaë and the bull.[4]

But these atrocities were too much even for the Rome of that day; and Seneca, who was not generally favourable to the Jews,[5] astounded at the results of philosophy as appearing in his pupil,

[1] Suet. Claud. 21; Plin. op. cit. xvi. 40. [2] Seneca, De Ira, 3, 18.

[3] Juv. Sat. i. 155, seq.

[4] Suet. Nero, 12. Clem. ad Cor. i. 6, does not refer to this, for the first book of Clement is acquainted with the book of Judith (cf. ch. lv.), and consequently was not written before the time of Trajan at earliest, and indeed shares in the circumstances under which the Pastor of Hermas was composed.

[5] Cf. Seneca, De Superst., ed. Haase, iii. 427.

broke out into lamentations over the rage of tyranny. "It has fire and sword at command, and fetters and a horde of wild beasts to let loose upon human bodies. There rise up before you the dungeon and the cross, the rack, the iron hook, and the stake driven through men's bodies till it comes out of their mouths; limbs torn asunder by chariots driven in opposite directions, and the shirt inwoven and overlaid with food for the flames, and every other invention of barbarous rage. No wonder there is so great fear of a thing that takes so many shapes, and arms itself with such hideous terrors. The effect produced by the torturer is in proportion to the number of instruments of torture he exhibits, for the sight of them will overcome a man who might have withstood the pain."[1] Tacitus, too, a bitter foe of this Oriental sect, attests the bad impression made by the form of punishment. "Compassion was roused, as though their unheard-of sufferings were devised, not for the public weal, but to satisfy the cruelty of a single individual."[2]

Thus it was that a common martyrdom united in death the friends and foes of Paul, the strong in faith and the weak, those who preached Christ whole-heartedly or for faction's sake. All traces of Paul's life vanish on this field of death. The cantonments on the *agger Tarquinii*, where the barracks of the prætorians were, had fallen a prey to the flames. But even if a kindly fate had not buried him in the ruins of a burning city, he must assuredly be looked for among the victims in the circus or the gardens of Nero, for it is quite incredible that the prisoner of Tigellinus should have escaped the universal fate of the Christians.

Of the friends who were perhaps in Rome at the same time, we meet with later traces, uncertain withal, of Timothy and Mark only. The abrupt ending of the document in the first person, and the consequent disconnected conclusion of the Acts, makes it probable, on the other hand, that Luke and Aristarchus perished with Paul, so that even their contemporaries had no

[1] Sen. Ep. 14. [2] Tac. Ann. xv. 44.

C. B. S. E.

clear knowledge of the last hours of the Apostle. Besides, those anxious weeks during which Tigellinus' spies and torturers and executioners wreaked their fury on the Church, gave no opportunity to inquire into the fate of individuals who had long been under the guard of the prætorians. The greater, then, was the impression made on the Christian Church by the burning of the city and the persecution of the saints. The woes of the last days seemed to have come upon them, especially as the example of persecution was followed elsewhere.[1] In Pergamus' Antipas, "the true witness," sealed the faith of the Christians with his blood, while others wasted away in prison. Pliny, too, takes it for granted that Christian persecutions had thenceforward taken place from time to time.[2] John, therefore, in his Apocalypse,[3] sees underneath God's altar the souls of those who were slain at the time of the fifth seal (Nero) for the testimony which they held. "And they cried with a great voice, saying, How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And there was given them to each a white robe; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little time, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, which should be killed even as they were, should be fulfilled."

5. The End of Nero.

The persecution of the year 64 offered so violent a contrast between Christian life and the profound corruption of the heathen world that the dualism dominating the Church's conception of life becomes perfectly intelligible. The god of this

[1] Rev. ii. 13, xx. 4; Oros. vii. 7; Sulpic. Sev. ii. 28; Corp. Insc. L. iv. 679. The inscription of Marquesia taken from Gruther's Thesaurus Insc. is admitted as genuine by Francke, Trajan, p. 553, but rejected by Schiller, Nero, p. 439.

[2] Ep. x. 97.

[3] Rev. vi. 9—11.

world is the devil, who leads the multitude; the Lord has separated for himself only a little band, who have received from above a peace which the world knows not, words that the world cannot utter, and a constancy effected by the spirit. Yet it seems hardly possible that the same human spirit gave rise at once to the Satires of Petronius, which revel in the lowest obscenity, and to the sacred words of the Epistle to the Romans, here acclaiming the pangs and quivering death-agony of the innocent, there lavishing its pittance of poverty in tending the poor and sick. Such extremes meet at this time that we can understand how Christianity finds itself confronted by two opposing powers. On the one side, the army of the saints; on the other, a shrieking hell: on the one side, Christ; on the other, Antichrist; the Holy Spirit over against Satan, with the two irreconcilable kingdoms of the upper and the nether world. It is characteristic of the disorder of the times that mankind endured a prince like Nero four years longer, even after the deeds of 64; and when he fell in 68, no small section of his subjects regretted him and hoped for his return. The conspiracy of Piso, which dates back to the time of the fire, was wrecked in part by the unworthiness of the conspirators. The most conspicuous persons among the great number of those who paid with their lives for real or alleged participation in the unsuccessful attempt, were Tigellinus' colleague, Fænius Rufus, Seneca and his talented nephew, Lucan. Freed from this care, the Cæsar a second time celebrated his Neronian games, at which he recited his poems to the Senate and people, and in the guise of a harp-player humbly awaited the umpire's award.

The paling glory of Cæsarism was restored by Corbulo's great victory over the Parthians in 66, while the specious show of homage from the Parthian prince in the Forum Romanum, and the empty hope that the king would appear in person at Rome, filled the citizens one and all with vain belief in their own greatness. Rome with her own eyes saw the Parthian prince kneel to Nero, and receive the diadem of Armenia from the

Cæsar's hand. Thereupon all was forgotten; the murder of mother and wife, the burning of the city, the friends of Piso butchered like beasts at the slaughter. Nero was saluted as Imperator, infinite rejoicings filled the new-built city, and the Cæsar, escorted by the people, bore his laurel-wreath to the Capitol and closed the temple of Janus.[1]

The fact that at this moment war broke out in Palestine failed to damp their joy. On the contrary, never was war so acceptable to the Roman people as that against the Jews.[2] Never suspecting the fatal extension of the war, and reassured by the acclamation of the mob, Nero carried into effect his long-cherished wish of visiting Achaia, and had crossed over in the last months of 66. Thence he sent Vespasian to Judæa, while he himself sought new laurels in the home of art. Hellas paid for this honour with her finest statues, and suffered the shame of seeing the tyrant's worst excesses in the light of day, for he knew this was their home. The execution of Corbulo, the tyrant's gratitude for the salvation of the kingdom, also falls in this period. No sooner had the hero landed at Cenchreæ, than he received the order of death. The canal works to cut through the isthmus, the first sod of which was turned by Nero himself, and the farce of declaring Greece free, were the gifts which Nero left to his hosts, though they were never to enjoy them. Meanwhile, the freedman Helios, whom Nero had left as regent, pressed for his return. The people, deprived of their games, grew troublesome. Yet it was not till the beginning of 68 that the emperor gave ear to his counsel; even then he so little realized the gravity of the situation that he determined to drive from Naples to Rome as an Olympian victor, drawn by white horses. The victorious harper who had vanquished the singers of Greece returned to Rome, riding in the newly-gilt chariot which once bore Augustus in his triumph over Antony and

[1] Dio, lxiii. 5; Suet. Nero, 13.

[2] Tac. Hist. v. 1, 10. Augebat iras quod soli Judæi non cessissent.

Cleopatra, to hang 1808 wreaths of victory upon the obelisk of the Circus Maximus.

The principal reason which necessitated Nero's sudden return was a rising in Gaul. Relying on the characteristic restlessness of the southern Gauls, and the unsuppressed resistance of the Celts in the north—leagued, too, with the fanatics, whose blood-stained rites were prohibited by the laws of Claudius, and with the Druids, who were pent up in the Pyrenean valley[1]—the proprætor C. Julius Vindex, a romantic provincial, was enabled to attempt an insurrection against Rome, which at first professed to be no more than a rising against Nero's infamies. To protect himself against the legions on the Rhine and their energetic leader Verginius Rufus, Vindex offered the imperial throne to Galba, the governor of Hispania Tarraconensis. Meanwhile, before Galba had come to any resolution, Verginius Rufus fell upon the disorganized bands of the inconsiderate Gaul at Vesontio, and routed them. Vindex, the "Avenger," fell, after an inglorious battle. With the loss of its chief, the undertaking was rapidly suppressed, but the stone had been set rolling. The portentous name of "civil war"—dreadful to hear in memory of the reign of terror before Augustus, and unheard for ninety years—was already uttered. To resolve upon it was needless; the rashness of the Gauls had precipitated matters. Galba was hopelessly compromised; and the victorious general of Upper Germany, Verginius Rufus, was acclaimed Imperator by the legions against his will.

The news of Vindex' revolt reached Nero on March 19, while he was celebrating his games at Naples. It was the anniversary of his mother's death; the story runs that the name of Vindex rang in his ear like a trumpet. Nevertheless, he completed the games before setting out to Rome. Here he heard of the negociations between the "Avenger" and P. Sulpicius Galba, whose appearance gave the rebellion an entirely different character.

[1] Cf. Schiller, Nero, p. 262, seq.

The Sulpicii belonged to the most ancient nobility of the city, and used not to bow before the Domitii. Galba finally proclaimed his revolt from Nero on April 2, 68, and Otho, the governor of Lusitania and former husband of Poppæa, who had meantime died from Nero's rough treatment, joined the adventure.

Though there was but little pith in this disjointed enterprize, Nero was so fully convinced that his day of judgment had come, that he hardly prepared to defend himself. The confusion of his proposed plans, and the only less confusion of his actual measures, showed that the court was incapable of a struggle since Poppæa's death. Tigellinus, the captain of the prætorians, was excellent at arranging filthy banquets and carrying out orders of death; but now that it was a question of organizing means of defence, he disappears from the scene as a traitor.

The dreadful pause which generally precedes the clash of mighty armies dispirited Nero's followers still more. Instead of advancing against Galba, the emperor himself thought of flight to Egypt. Then he talked of abdicating his throne and maintaining himself by his harp.[1] Most striking of all, however, are the hopes he used to confide to his friends at table. He would go to Gaul; no sooner had he set foot on Gallic soil than he would go to meet the armies unarmed, and simply weep. With this infallible weapon he would quell the mutineers, and at the merry feast next day would gaily produce the songs of victory he was already engaged upon.[2] But all this failed to inspire confidence in the court; and when the imports of corn failed and want ensued, the people began to murmur. They were thoroughly ill-disposed to him, when it chanced that a ship from Egypt, which they imagined a corn ship, proved to be laden with sand from the Nile for the imperial wrestlers.[3] As suited the character of the time, childish sallies for the most part indicated the change in the temper of the city. A challenge

[1] Dio, lxiii. 27; Suet. Nero, 40; Plut. Galba, 17.

[2] Suet. Nero, 43.

[3] Suet. Nero, 45; Plin. H. N. xxxv. 47.

was inscribed on Nero's statues; the real contest, it ran, had come; let him now come forward. Some one wrote on the pillars, "He has even roused the cocks (Gallos) with his singing." By night, crowds fought with cudgels, and shouted loudly for the "Vindex,"[1] i.e. the watch. At the same time, the city was full of rumours telling how the ladies of the court were making themselves Amazonian garments in which to take the field with the army, and had cut their hair short; how sentence of death was pronounced on all proconsuls, all senators, or indeed the whole city: in short the *aura popularis* had veered, and everything boded a storm.

But what turned the scale was that the matricide, tormented by the Erinnyes, gave himself up for lost. The whole city knew of his dreams, in which he sat in a boat with Agrippina, or met his wife Octavia in a dark cavern, or was beset by the pillars in the theatre of Pompey.[2] The prefect Tigellinus was as helpless as his master; his colleague, Nymphidius Sabinus, hoped to ascend the throne himself by the aid of the garrison. Surrounded by men who despaired of him and of themselves, the emperor was finally persuaded by Nymphidius to retire to the Servilian gardens near Ostia.[3] There he elaborated a popular manifesto, in which he renounced his throne and prayed for forgiveness, at the same time begging to be appointed procurator of Egypt.[4]

While he thus hesitated, Nymphidius hastened to inform the Roman garrison that Nero had abandoned them and fled to Egypt. On the strength of this, the soldiers were persuaded to declare for Galba, who was also recognized by the Senate. Nero woke on the 8th of June to find himself alone at his villa. During the night his cohort of prætorians had left him, the courtiers had vanished, even his freedmen and slaves were gone, with few exceptions. One of those who remained true while the great personages fled was Phaon, who resolved to take him to his small homestead on the Via Patinaria. All that

[1] Suet. Nero, 45. [2] Ibid. 46. [3] Ibid. 47. [4] Ibid.

was left of the Julian empire was borne in a single carriage. The scribe Epaphroditus, and the boys Neophytus and Sporus, with the latter of whom Nero once went through the form of marriage in Greece, were all the following of him who yesterday was called the lord of the world. Historians have given a romantic account of the emperor's last journey, as he passed along the street with veiled face. From the camp of the prætorians rang out the trumpets in honour of Galba. Then the horses shied at a corpse; a flash of lightning lit up Nero's features; he was recognized and saluted by a prætorian; and Phaon lashed on his horses at double speed. Finally, all descended from the carriage and crept through mud and reeds to Phaon's villa, where Nero was admitted by a back door for fear the slaves should recognize him.

Meanwhile, when once the prætorians had given Nero up, the fathers of the city remembered that they were the ancient Roman Senate. They declared themselves a tribunal to try the fugitive prince, outdid one another in abuse of him, and finally passed judgment in the terrible sentence that he should be beaten to death "according to ancestral custom." Nero learned his impending fate; but it was not before he heard the clattering accoutrements of the approaching horsemen sent to arrest him, that he made repeated attempts to draw a dagger across his throat, till Epaphroditus had pity and guided his trembling hand aright. The prætorian who entered professed he had come to help him; but Nero cried, "Too late: that is the truth;" and with these words gave up the ghost, deluded as ever.[1]

At Rome, the aristocracy rejoiced, the people mourned. The masses who lived on the imperial bounty and were long disused to labour, were convinced that no new Cæsar would take so much trouble over "bread and games" as he who had been torn from them in his thirtieth year. Moreover, the prætorians began to talk already of Galba's avarice. Icelus, the new

[1] Suet. Nero, 49.

emperor's freedman, found it necessary to permit the honourable burial of Nero's body in the tomb of the Domitii. Attended by the faithful Acte and two nurses, Nero was buried at an expenditure of 200,000 sesterces; he was even furnished with a sarcophagus of porphyry and a marble altar.[1] His continued following among the people is shown by the wreaths laid on his tomb at night, by the rumour that he was not dead, but would speedily return, and by numerous edicts scattered abroad or nailed up on the rostra, in which he in his own name announced his return.[2] Popular satisfaction was displayed, too, in the greeting accorded to an embassy from the Parthian king Vologæses, which came to renew the alliance with Rome, and took occasion to beg the Senate to honour the memory of Nero, who reconciled two empires, and permit them to erect a monument to their old friend and ally.[3] This was the origin of the rumour that the betrayed Cæsar had escaped to the Parthians, at whose head he would return to drive away his enemies.[4] It was not long before pretenders took advantage of this belief and tried to restore the glories of Nero. Some hoped, others feared, the report was true. Nero's return to punish Rome was, in particular, a firm expectation among the Christians,[5] who spoke in obscure parables of a head which seemed "as though it had been smitten unto death; and his death-stroke was healed; and the whole earth wondered after the beast."[6]

[1] Suet. Nero, 49, 50.

[2] Ibid. 57; Tit. 7; Tac. Hist. i. 78, ii. 95.

[3] Suet. Nero, 57; Aurel. Vict. Epit. 5. [4] Dio Chrysost. Or. xxi. 9.

[5] Suet. Nero, 57; Dio, lxiv. 9; Tac. Hist. i. 2, ii. 8, 9; Zonar. xi. 15, p. 484, and i. 18, p. 496, 12.

[6] Rev. xiii. 3, 12.

Seventh Division.

THE JEWISH WAR.

THE JEWISH WAR.

1. The First Insurrection.

The brief administration of Festus was the last attempt to restore order in Judæa. The Parthians once defeated by Corbulo in 63, and the Armenian question settled, Rome was no longer concerned to use gentle means in pacifying the unruly province. Josephus certainly regards it as the mission of the last governor to provoke an open outbreak, an idea not contradicted by Tacitus when he drily sums up the situation in these words: *duravit patientia Judæis usque ad Gessium Florum procuratorem.*[1] Rome was weary of intervention, and preferred open insurrection to a guerilla war which constantly employed the legions and kept the whole East in commotion. The new principle of government, introduced since the coming of Albinus, was systematic ill-treatment of the well-to-do and peaceful, and immunity for the banditti. After the failure of a brief effort to put down these banditti by wholesale executions, an arrangement was come to with the robbers in their mountain fastnesses. Those of them who had been captured by the local authorities were admitted to ransom, and a regular traffic in prisoners went forward on either side.

By this time, no personal changes could have done any good; the change that did take place in 65 was only for the worse. Gessius Florus of Clazomenæ, as Josephus put it, differed from Albinus as the hangman from the robber. What Albinus did underhand, Florus did with serviceable publicity. His wife

[1] Hist. v. 10.

Cleopatra was a friend of Poppæa, so that he had nothing to fear in Rome.[1] Weary of guerilla warfare, he stirred up insurrection. He longed to have his foe in the open field, and annihilate him at one blow. The calm indifference to murder and arson displayed by the garrison, encouraged the bandits and gave ground for the rumour that the procurator took a share of their plunder. The growing insecurity forced entire villages to emigrate;[2] the priests directed their appeals for help now to Cæsarea and now to Antioch. At the Passover of 66, C. Cestius Gallus, the proconsul of Syria, once more came up to Jerusalem in person to learn the truth about the situation. The Jews flung themselves about his horse and cried out against Florus, who listened to their appeals with a disdainful smile.

But the proconsul himself brought the priests new terrors instead of confidence. Nero's rebuilding of Rome after the fire consumed fabulous sums, which the provinces were compelled to supply. To distribute the burden fairly, it was necessary to take a census. Now the miseries of Judæa had begun with the former census of Quirinius. That numbering of the people was one of the causes of the disquiet which had never ceased since in Judæa. It may be imagined how the consul's orders for a new census in a time of popular ferment were received by the priests. A happy moment, indeed, to number the Jews. Cestius saw this, and left the high-priest to manage the counting in his own way. As a preliminary, the priests gave the number of paschal lambs slaughtered in the city. They next proposed to allow ten persons to every paschal meal, but Cestius thought twenty nearer the mark. They finally agreed to reckon those who came to the feast at three millions, and calculate the tax on this basis. Thus all knowledge of the abomination was confined to the secret meetings of the Jewish priests and Roman officials, and gave no new cause for disturbance.[3] After settling this difficulty, the proconsul returned to Antioch; Florus, on the other hand, continued his provocations, for, as the priests

[1] Ant. xx. 11, 1. [2] Ibid. [3] Bell. vi. 9, 3.

declared, nothing short of open war could cast a veil over his illegalities.

After all the years of dreaming and scheming among the Jews, it cannot but appear strange that he had such difficulty in driving the Jewish population to this last expedient. But the rapine and outrage of the last two years had given the people a foretaste of civil war. Though the smoke of burning villages rose up on every side, and entire communities were butchered or fled abroad, this was the very moment that a new peace party sprang into being. If we can credit the assurances of Flavius Josephus, the great mass of the people would hear no more of war. It was desired at most by the fanatical Judæa; the valley of the Jordan and Peræa remained tranquil even after war broke out; and during the war the disposition of the peasantry in Galilee was proved in a most startling manner.[1] The consciousness, however, that things could not remain as they were, but would soon give place to dire catastrophes, lay upon the people like an incubus. The comet which terrified Nero, struck equal fear into the Jews. Strange rumours were current among the people. In a region where everything is clothed in the marvellous, the temper of the Galilean peasantry produced the strangest results during the war. In 62, when open disorder reached its highest point, a peasant named Joshua appeared in Jerusalem at the feast of Tabernacles, and suddenly began to cry in tones of prophetic ecstasy: "Voices of morning, voices of evening, voices of the four winds, voices about Jerusalem and the temple, voices about the bridegroom and the bride, voices about the whole people. Woe, woe for Jerusalem!"

He cried thus day and night in every street. The prophet of evil was to be heard on every public occasion, at every feast. He was scourged by the synagogues, and imprisoned by the Sanhedrin; his flesh was cut to ribbons by the rods of the procurator Albinus; yet at every blow he cried, "Woe, woe to Jerusalem!" At last he was suffered to go his way, as a madman.

[1] Bell. iv. 2, 1; Vita, 22, &c.

He cursed none that struck him, thanked none that fed him, and had no answer for any but his "Woe, woe to Jerusalem!" until in the course of the siege his mouth was closed by a stone from a Roman ballista. The strain and anxiety had unhinged this poor wretch's mind. A similar symptom of the secret and universal dread was the currency of numberless tales of terror. At the Passover of 66, the altar of burnt sacrifice, it was said, shone with the brightness of day for half-an-hour before dawn. At the same feast, a cow gave birth to a calf while being led to the altar by the priest. The eastern gate of the temple opened of itself at midnight, and before sunset chariots and armed hosts were seen in the sky marching through the clouds and enveloping the country and cities. Still more dire were the events at Pentecost. When the priest went to the temple at night, there sprang up a noise which swelled into tempestuous uproar, and then many voices repeated the words, "Let us go hence."[1] Such were the shadows cast by coming events, and darkening the minds of all. Even those who desired the war, doubted not that it was the dreadful decisive battle foretold by the prophets since Moses, preliminary to the Messianic kingdom. In general, the lawyers were convinced that the prophecy of Isaiah xi., "In those days," could only mean the days which had now come upon them. This opinion was shared by Josephus, and even Suetonius and Tacitus mention it as one of the prime causes of the war; vague rumours of this prophetic saying were current throughout the kingdom.[2]

Under these circumstances, the multitude submitted to their fate with sullen resignation. One party alone developed any stronger desire to avert the inevitable at the eleventh hour. It consisted of the members of the priestly aristocracy, who had something to lose; the educated classes, who knew the power of Rome better than the fanatical multitude; and even a section of the Pharisees, who had long been urging on this

[1] Bell. vi. 5, 3, seq.

[2] Jos. Bell. Prol. 2, vi. 5, 4; Tac. Hist. v. 13; Suet. Vesp. 4.

crisis.[1] They found war no longer a matter of theory; it stood before them in all its actual terrors. For years and years they had employed all the petty arts at the command of the Rabbis to stir up the people and spur them on; now they would have given a good deal to lay the tempest they had let loose. Many a time during these latter years had they alarmed the whole nation with the cry, "The temple is in danger:" now we see them not seldom display their priestly pomp to the full in order to calm the excited multitudes, and quiet them in the name of those same sacred emblems for whose sake the people had so long been alarmed and disquieted.[2] At the head of this party of birth, culture and learning, stood Agrippa II., whose object it was on the one hand to calm the people, on the other to obtain terms from the Romans. What he most wanted was to persuade the emperor that the only solution of this fatal entanglement was the restoration of an Herodian kingdom.

The programme of this party is fully described by Josephus, Hist. ii. 16, 4, 5. It cannot be denied that the policy advocated by Agrippa had a certain justification. As a recognized vassal-state, it was possible for Judæa to live for the theocratic interests of most concern to her, as was shown by the brief reign of Herod Agrippa I. His reign, moreover, had effected a reconciliation between the Herods and the Jewish people, and the transference, already tried, of religious matters to the Herods might have renewed the ancient bond between them. The following of the dynasty was undoubtedly on the increase. In proportion as the Pharisaic party saw itself repulsed by the Zealots, and the men of action taking the place of the Rabbinical authorities, their sympathies inclined to the dynasty whose last sovereign had ruled the state according to the wishes of their own party. Unfortunately, the man who, the Pharisees hoped, would save Israel, was unequal to his position. His invariable want of skill in choosing his high-priests pursued him to the end. He had replaced Annas, the murderer of James, by Jesus,

[1] Bell. ii. 16, 2; 15, 4. [2] Bell. ii. 15, 4; 16, 4; Ant. xx. 6, 1.

son of Damnæus. But the latter also was among the enemies of Rome,[1] and had to be replaced by Jesus, son of Gamaliel. By this time, however, insubordination had reached such a pitch, that the priests refused to recognize the new appointment. Jesus, son of Gamaliel, who afterwards appears closely connected with Annas and shared his subsequent fate,[2] had the inferior priests against him. Both parties armed; the exercise of the high-priest's power was decided by street-fights, in which the priests assailed one another with stones and bludgeons. Nor was this all: Agrippa's own family joined in the fray; two of the worst gangs were commanded by the king's cousins, Costobar and Saul. Agrippa was unable to crush the two rivals till he was backed up by the iron hand of Gessius Florus. In their place he set up a last high-priest, Matthias, son of Theophilus, who came at the right moment to bear the sacred vessels against the rebels.[3] Thus the king had directly installed and deposed not less than six high-priests; without sheltering the lower, he had not befriended the upper grades of priests. Immediately before the outbreak of the war, a great rising took place against him. To leave a memorial of his name in the annals of the temple-worship, he gave the Levite psalm-singers the priestly right of wearing linen garments, and authorized the servants of the temple to learn the sacred chants. The Pharisees, as well as the priests, were transported with anger at this innovation, and Josephus prophesied the destruction of the city for this defiance of the law.[4]

Yet this was really nothing more than the dust before the storm. War had practically begun when king Agrippa and his friends refused to see anything more than riot and tumult, flattering themselves with the hope that the tempest could be entirely allayed with a few impressive speeches, despatches to the Roman officials, or some tears from the lovely Bernice.

[1] Bell. vi. 2, 2.

[2] Cf. Schürer, Die ἀρχιερεῖς im Neuen Test. Stud. u. Krit. 1872, p. 606.

[3] Ant. xx. 9, 7; Bell. ii. 15, 4.

[4] Ant. xx. 9, 6.

But the time for these petty arts was past. While Agrippa directed brilliant oratory to the task of convincing the people where passion is incapable of conviction, the embittered parties were already beginning to try conclusions in the towns of Palestine and their vicinity.

The disturbances came to a head in Cæsarea. The struggle over the nationality of the city had been settled by Nero in 66 in favour of the Greeks. The Jews ascribed this decision to the corruption of the imperial preceptor, Burrus; but it was impossible for Seneca and Burrus to permit the Judaizing of the coast when the Hellenizing of the East was the object of Roman policy established by Cæsar.[1] This award, then, gave up the city to the Syrians, the mainstay of the government since Herod Agrippa. Universal derision of the Jews ensued. A debatable piece of building ground, over which the Jews claimed a right of way to their synagogue, was the chosen spot where the adversaries used to measure their strength at nightfall. Here, one Sabbath, when the Jewish congregation was on its way to the synagogue, a Greek youth offered up on a lidless vessel an offering of birds for the healing of the leprous. Transported by this allusion to the Gentile tradition of the Jews' descent from leprous Egyptians, the victims of the insult began a brawl which soon led to regular street-fighting and the plunder of Jewish houses. Thereupon the Jewish population quitted the city with their rolls of the law, and betook themselves to Narbata, the nearest Jewish hamlet. The envoys sent to Florus at Sebaste were shut up by him in a Samaritan prison, on the ground that the Jews had decamped with their sacred books and deserted the synagogue, an act in which the procurator saw reprehensible agitation and the desecration of a temple.

While these events had now flung the whole of Judæa into commotion, the exaction of the tribute-money at Antioch had been completed; and Florus was commissioned to take from the

[1] Cf. Schiller, Nero, p. 214.

temple-treasure a sum of seventeen talents as a first instalment of the forty talents due. The Corban itself might be preserved intact by a toll upon those who came up to the temple. Now Nero was exacting money in every quarter for his vast buildings; Greece and its treasures of art he pillaged in person; so that Judæa did but suffer the fate of other provinces. But the fanatical cry of Corban was instantly raised from a thousand throats. They professed to believe it a personal exaction of the procurators, and called on the people to defend the property of Jehovah. A number of noisy lads gave bold expression to popular suspicion, going through the city, basket in hand, to collect alms for the penniless Florus.

The procurator immediately occupied Jerusalem. The Sanhedrin being unable to give him the names of the guilty at once, he gave over the upper market to pillage, and crucified such of the rebels as he had seized, amongst them some leading Jews of equestrian rank in the Roman service. At this juncture, king Agrippa was at Alexandria, paying a visit of compliment to the newly-appointed procurator, Tiberius Alexander. Bernice, however, was in the city. On one of her pious pilgrimages she had taken a Nazirite vow, and laid her beautiful hair as an offering in the temple. When her envoys were rudely repulsed by Florus, she prepared to approach Florus herself for grace, bare-footed, and in the guise of a suppliant. But the insults of the soldiery compelled her to fly for refuge into the Asmonean castle, where she passed the night, surrounded by armed servants, in continual terror of death.

This is the day from which Josephus dates the beginning of the outbreak, May 16, 66. On the following day, the procurator artfully contrived a fresh collision between his troops and the unarmed populace. This exhausted the patience of the strongest advocates of peace. The people rushed to arms and hurried to the temple. The porches were broken open and the treasure conveyed to the fortress. Thereupon, Florus quitted the city, leaving a cohort in the Antonia, with which the

high-priests promised to maintain order. Meanwhile Agrippa had returned to Palestine and tried his artifices once more. Bernice wrote to the proconsul Cestius at Antioch, with her own hand; and then Agrippa came to Jerusalem, accompanied by a tribune appointed by the proconsul. But not to compromise his character at court as a friend of Rome, the king acted with great severity towards the leaders of the insurrection. He would not hear of sending an embassy to Nero, "for he was still averse to appearing as the accuser of Florus."[1] Instead of this, he called an assembly of the people before the palace. Making his sister Bernice sit beside him in the colonnade (xystum), "so that she could be seen from every side," he addressed the people in a speech explaining all the reasons against a revolution. In particular he distinguished between Florus' government and the Roman people, and endeavoured to make plain to every one what folly it was to begin war with a whole nation because this nation in one case had exceedingly bad officials. His best argument, it must be admitted, was the overwhelming power of Rome, proving it by a hundred instances, and at the same time depreciating the military strength of his own nation, and scouting the idea of help from the Parthian Jews as childish and chimerical. Bursting into tears, he and his sister enforced their reference to all the misery to come, by making the people responsible for every abomination which war could not fail to bring upon the Holy Land—violation of the Sabbath, transgression of the laws of meats, interruption of worship in the temple, the destruction, it might be, of the sanctuary.

Even at this juncture the appeal to the most sacred feelings of Judaism did not fail. Once more the populace gave way. While men of property set about collecting the arrears of taxes, Agrippa and Bernice placed themselves at the head of the obedient people, to begin the immediate repair of the broken

[1] Jos. Bell. ii. 16, 3.

porches. But now the king, desirous of putting the finishing touches to his work, invoked the aid of Florus. This was too much; the long-strained patience of the people gave way. Agrippa was forced to retire before a furious storm of execrations and stones directed against the traitor. Enraged with the populace so utterly devoid of political sense, he instantly left Jerusalem, bidding his friends join Florus at Cæsarea.

Then the chief of the temple, Eleazar, a son of Annas, required the priests to reject Cæsar's sacrifice for the Roman people. The high-priests and the most learned Rabbis, indeed, declared it impious to stop any who offered sacrifice; the oldest priests affirmed that there was no precedent for it. But the words of wisdom fell on deaf ears. Not even Levites were forthcoming to undertake the sacrifice. The high-priests were forced to content themselves with despatching envoys of rank, to Florus, Simon the son of Annas, and to Agrippa, the Boëthusi Saul, Antipas and Costobar, to assure them that the hierarchy had no part in these proceedings.

So when news came of the emperor's fall, Agrippa hesitated no longer. By arrangement with his friends, his troops secured the upper city and began the struggle with the insurgents. But by this time the rising had also broken out in the south. Menahem, a son of the Gaulonite, had stormed the Roman fort of Masada on the Dead Sea, that fortress where the first Herod had gathered vast stores of arms. The people equipped themselves with this old but serviceable material of war. At the feast of wood, when the country people used to bring gifts of wood to the temple, a host of auxiliaries came up to Jerusalem. Agrippa's troops were unable to hold the city, and deserted their friends. The upper city was plundered; and the palaces of Agrippa, Bernice and the high-priest Ananias, burnt down. The latter, indeed, Paul's brutal judge, who may now have really appeared like a whited wall, was the especial object of popular fury. He succeeded, it is true, in escaping to the underground

sewers; but he was tracked down, and dragged into the streets by Menahem's people, and perished miserably with his brother Ezechias.[1]

The son of Judas the Gaulonite now came into his father's inheritance. Arrayed in royal robes, he directed the war against Rome from the temple, and incited his bands against the citadel of Antonia.[2] Agrippa's troops soon capitulating, Florus' cohort was unable to hold the fortress, and retired to the three strongest towers on Mount Sion, Hippicus, Phasael and Mariamne. The citadel of Antonia was fired by the insurgents, and demolished on the side which threatened the temple. After a while it was seen with horror that the removal of this north-western corner had reduced the area of the temple to a square, for the Rabbis taught according to Dan. viii. 22, that the temple must perish if once it became a square—the sign of the world, and therefore of uncleanness. Meanwhile, the aristocracy had recovered from their first alarm, and sought to get rid of the Galilean Messiah. Annas the younger and Eleazar resolved to establish their own power in his stead. They waylaid Menahem as he came, robed in purple, to the temple, and with the aid of the people, who were tired of the terror, scattered his following. The tumult was suppressed, Menahem himself captured and slowly tortured to death.

But Eleazar, son of Simon, who thus seized upon power, continued the war against the Romans, who were at length forced to capitulate. With Semitic perfidy, Eleazar swore to give them free passage; but no sooner had they left their fortress than they were put to the sword regardless of the pledge. The tribune Metilius alone saved his life by promising to submit to circumcision.

Meanwhile, the news of Florus' retreat reached Antioch. The proconsul Cestius determined to suppress the disturbance at once. He crossed the frontier with the twelfth legion and Agrippa's auxiliaries who were at his disposal. His legate occu-

[1] Bell. ii. 17; 6, 9. [2] Ibid. ii. 17, 8.

pied Galilee without meeting any serious resistance. Towards the end of September, he advanced in person against Jerusalem with fire and sword, guided by king Agrippa. Joppa and Lydda were burnt to the ground. From the walls of Zion could be seen the smoke of burning towns on every side. The king made a last effort at intervention, but the Jews scornfully repulsed the man who condescended to act as guide to the legions, and who, from fear of the Romans, had never punished the slaughter of Jews in his Syrian dominions. Yet his partizans within the city established treacherous communications with the besiegers, and, on Oct. 30th, their help enabled Cestius to storm the new town. But when the proconsul failed to carry the upper city and temple at the first assault, he found himself in a precarious situation, with his small army in the midst of a nation in arms, and began a retreat. So long as he marched northwards over the mountain plateau of Judæa, things went fairly well; but the Jews swarmed on every side, and on Nov. 8th the army could only gain the pass of Bethhoron by abandoning its baggage. But this failed to check the guerillas. As the cohorts entered upon the road through the narrow gorges on the western declivity of Mount Ephraim, they found the heights already occupied by the insurgents. Separated in small defiles, confined in deep ravines, which neither permitted the alignment of the mass of men nor the use of cavalry, the Romans were reduced to hopeless confusion. The Jews pressed on in denser masses, and the Romans made fainter resistance, till at last the soldier-like retreat turned into headlong flight, from which the proconsul escaped to Antipatris with the scattered remnants of his legion.

This defeat was the signal for a general outbreak. The rising spread over the country from the Dead Sea to Lebanon; a War-sanhedrin was organized in Jerusalem, and assumed the chief conduct of military operations. Since the defeat of Pætus in Armenia, the Roman power in the East had received no check to be compared with the destruction of the twelfth legion and

the flight of the Syrian proconsul. Happily for Rome, the hatred of the Jews throughout the province put any assistance from the Syrians out of the question. Far from it; the first news of actual war sufficed to set on foot the worst persecution of the Jews that had ever been known in all Syria, Phœnicia, Peræa and Egypt.

First of all, the Gentiles in Cæsarea flung themselves upon their old enemies, and left not one of the hated race alive. The Jews hastened to take reprisals at Philadelphia, Gerasa, Pella, Scythopolis, and other Gentile cities. They also overran Gadaritis and Hippos, Gaulanitis, Cedasa, Ptolemais, Gaba and the province of Cæsarea. The hated Sebaste and Ascalon were laid in ashes; but their arm reached no further. They only succeeded in preparing a more terrible end for their countrymen in the threatened towns, such as Tyre and Damascus; for in all these places the populace fell upon the Jewish quarter and filled the streets with corpses. Even in Agrippa's dominions the Gentile garrison attacked the subjects of their king; all Syria, in short, was in terrible confusion.

In Alexandria, the Greek populace seized the opportunity to revive the days of Caligula. More than 60,000 Jews were sacrificed to Egyptian fanaticism and Greek hatred, without any attempt to save his people on the part of the procurator, Tiberius Alexander, a nephew of Philo. When the civil war was in full swing, he ordered his troops to burn down the Jewish quarter, for the sake of which his father and uncle had defied Caligula.

Thus, instead of the expected support throughout the Dispersion, the leaders of the insurrection received one message of ill after another, telling how Jehovah had smitten Israel. Once more the government of Nero displayed the same swift decision which had always crowned their military undertakings with success. The emperor gave Cestius Gallus permission to choose his own punishment,[1] and sent Flavius Vespasianus, who had

[1] Tac. Hist. v. 10, is certainly to be understood in this sense.

been trained in Britain, as commander-in-chief, and Licinius Mucianus as proconsul of the province of Syria. The one was known as a cold-blooded general, the other as a man of prudence and statesmanship. It was already clear that the insurrection would not spread to the neighbouring provinces; and it was not long before the Jews learnt that even their nearest kindred, the Arabians, had joined their enemies. Surrounded on every side, isolated and invaded, they still clung fast to belief in that help from above for which they had waited so long in vain.

---

2. Annas and Josephus.

Revolution in Palestine was, after all, far from hopeless at a moment when peace had scarcely been made with the Parthians; while another war was preparing in Gaul, and a third continued in Britain; while the Germans were restless, and a general rising against Nero's government was well within the bounds of possibility. Oriental repugnance to the Latin dominion was so deeply rooted, that even those who knew the Syrian and Arabian hatred of the Jews, might still expect these tribes to change their attitude after a great defeat of the Romans. Such was the prospect before the leaders of the rebellion, according to Josephus' preface to his History of the War. More particularly they reckoned on assistance from the Babylonian Jews *en masse*, and expected heavy money contributions at least from the Dispersion, considering that the very existence of the temple was at stake.

It cannot be said that these expectations entirely failed. The example of Tarsus in Cilicia proves that the Jews of Further Asia came in part to the assistance of their countrymen with their lives and their money,[1] and a certain amount of help came

[1] Philostr. Ap. v. 35, at all events, may be supposed to speak of such aid to Jerusalem.

also from the East. Silas of Babylon, Niger of Peræa, Monobazus and Cenedæus, princes of the house of the Jewish kings of Adiabene, had taken an active share in the pursuit of Cestius; the robber bands of Trachonitis and Hauranitis were particularly forward in the insurrection, though rather from love of war than of the Jews.[1] But the fate of the insurrection turned, not on the absence of external help, but on the half-heartedness of its leaders. From the very first, the aristocratic leaders of the war had an eye to its conclusion. They had no desire to fight the Romans, but to come to terms with them on condition of the independence of Judæa under a Herod or the Pharisees. The Zealots, on the other hand, shrank from any alliance with Gentiles against Gentiles, thinking that Jehovah would do all unaided.

Thus the conduct of the war was impaired from the first. Nothing but the traditional conservatism and bondage of the East to custom can explain the fact that, even after the high-priests had given sufficient proof of their ill intentions, the leaders of the war were chosen from amongst those who were called to the leadership of Israel by virtue of the law. True that they were the sole repositories of affairs of the law and traditional authority; but they wanted the will as well as the capacity to carry on a revolutionary war. Their representatives took their places on the council of war and at the head of the army to facilitate a compromise with the Romans, and to secure their personal ascendency by secret services to Agrippa and the friends of Rome.[2] Such was the intention with which the younger Annas, with his friend Jesus, son of Gamaliel, and Joseph, son of Gorion, had assumed the supreme direction in Jerusalem. Their first care was to get rid of Eleazar, son of Simon, the idolized leader of the Zealots, the conqueror of Cestius, who, moreover, was famed among the people for miraculous powers and other mysterious gifts. They were not

[1] Bell. ii. 19, 3; 20, 4; iii. 10, 10.

[2] Cf. the cynical admissions of Josephus, Bell. ii. 21, 3; Vita, v.

wholly successful. The mighty soldier had the people on his side, and the booty taken from Cestius in his power. Considering the superstitious reverence paid him by the multitude, there was always the fear of his immediately assuming the part of a Messiah.[1] The plan of operations therefore remained two-fold. Jesus, the son of Sapphias, was sent to Idumæa with Eleazar, the only son of Ananias Nebedæi. Similarly, Manasses might be of use in Peræa, and the Essene John in Thamna; but in the capital the aristocracy could not let the reins of power out of their hand. Two members of the highest class of priests were likewise sent where the collision must first take place: to Samaria, John, the son of Ananias; and to Galilee, Josephus, son of Matthias, and a friend of the high-priest, Jesus ben Gamaliel.[2] Their chief care, the collection of the priestly tithes, was not forgotten by the self-seeking aristocracy even at this moment. They made the best of this favourable opportunity for a strict exaction of the temple-tithe, which had been steadily decreasing in the province under the Romans and the Herods.[3]

The two persons on whom the fortunes of their country primarily depended, according to this division of parts, were the leaders of the council of war—namely, the high-priest ANNAS,[4] and the commandant of Galilee, the young JOSEPHUS. We have already met with Annas as a true scion of the proud and overbearing Sadducees. In the short three months of his high-priesthood he had stained himself with the blood of James the Just and other Nazarenes, so that his house maintained the reputation of destroying both master and disciples of the new

[1] Bell. ii. 20, 3; iv. 4, 1. [2] Vita, 41.

[3] For what follows, cf. my article on Flavius Josephus in Sybel's Histor. Zeitschrift of 1865.

[4] The fact that the man condemned by Josephus, Ant. xx. 9, 1, and represented as equivocal, Vita, 38, 39, 44, 60, is identical with the Annas so highly esteemed by the people, Bell. ii. 20, 3; 22, 1; iv. 3, 7, throws a characteristic light on Josephus' credibility; but it admits of no doubt, because in Bell. iv. 3, 9, the famous leader of the War-sanhedrin is expressly named as Annas, son of Annas.

sect. The second act of his public life was played in the streets of Jerusalem. The heartless policy of the aristocrats, which gave up the lower classes of priests to starvation by claiming the entire tithes for the upper classes, found its chief representatives in him and Paul's stony-hearted judge, Ananias Nebedæi. But while his friend Ananias was killed like a dog in the streets of Jerusalem, he entered the War-sanhedrin. Next to him in this strangely-gathered council was the former high-priest, Jesus ben Gamaliel, who in his day had fought for the high-priesthood in the streets of Jerusalem with Jesus ben Damnai.[1]

With his customary energy, Annas immediately took in hand the completion of the wall, and at first seemed to take his task more seriously than "the prudent" had expected.[2] A great inducement, indeed, was the money in the hands of Eleazar, the conqueror of Cestius. For this, Annas, who was notorious among all the lower priests for avarice, betrayed his own party.[3] So for a time he vacillated; but when the party of the Zealots grew strong in the course of the war, the proud blood of the Sadducees stirred in the veins of the son of Annas. He declared it impious to depart from the order of priestly classes in allotting offices, and with Jesus, the son of Gamaliel, began to urge the people towards the preservation of the temple, i.e. to peace.[4] Now, as before, he finds that really it is the Romans who respect the law, the Zealots who trample it underfoot; and he greets the Roman eagles as the symbol of true liberty and genuine piety.[5] Clearly the treasure won from Cestius was exhausted, and the money of Rome seemed equally acceptable. But he was not a man to leave the result to abstract considerations. He secretly armed his followers, and thus was the first to give the word for that terrible civil war[6] which rent Jerusalem asunder, and in which he and Jesus, the son of Gamaliel, met

[1] Ant. xx. 9, 4.
[2] Bell. ii. 22, 1.
[3] Vita, 39, 40; Bell. ii. 20, 3.
[4] Bell. iv. 3, 7—5, 2.
[5] Ibid. iv. 3, 10.
[6] Ibid. iv. 3, 12.

with their end, a fate eloquently lamented by Josephus, but amply deserved.

The conduct of the war in the country was the same as in the capital. But the interested choice of leaders, and the empty struggle to divert the revolution to the purposes of the theocracy, were in no province so momentous as in Galilee. Here was the turning-point of the whole war. Situated on the very borders of Syria, it had to bear the first onset of the enemy, and at the same time was of the greatest importance for defence, as the most fertile, most populous, and most warlike province. For apart from the fact that this must be the scene of the first battles—and in such affairs the beginning means much—Galilee was also the chief support of the insurrection. The country was rich; it secured the connections with aid coming from the upper Euphrates; it was the home of the wild and boisterous young fellows whose arrival was always waited for at Jerusalem if anything serious was forward at a feast. Yet it was also the weak point of the country. The Herods had not ventured to build any fortresses over against Syria, so that the country lay open to the advance of the legions. For many reasons, then, this was the critical point of the whole campaign. This all-important position was regarded by the Sanhedrin in its usual way. Among the notables of the party, none was more brilliant than the young Josephus, son of Matthias, and friend of Jesus ben Gamaliel. His ancestors had played a great part in the records of the high-priesthood; his mother was related to the Maccabees; he was reputed a zealous Pharisee, and had been in Rome—reasons enough for the aristocracy to form the highest expectations of him. Let us look somewhat more closely at the man, who was still under thirty years of age and ignorant of war, but had been suddenly transferred from the schools of Rabbinism to the theatre of war.

In the same year, 35, that the Apostle Paul definitely separated from Pharisaism to the Christian Church, a lad of sixteen entered the schools of the Pharisees at Jerusalem to study the

law, as once Saul of Tarsus had studied.[1] He was Joseph, the son of Matthias, of the tribe of Levi. The Rabbis of the house of Hillel, whose most famous teacher was the aged Gamaliel, gained in him a scholar whose high birth and brilliant education had only once been equalled among all who were ever committed to the synagogue of the temple.[2] Josephus' account of himself in his Memoirs recalls the Gospel according to St. Luke: "As a boy of fourteen I was noted by all for my craving after knowledge, even high-priests and the chief of the city coming to inquire of me concerning important interpretations of the law."[3] Equal self-satisfaction pervades his criticism of himself at the end of the Antiquities: "As my fellow-countrymen bear witness of me that I have distinguished myself in the learning of our land, so, too, I have made myself familiar with the Greek tongue, although fluency in speaking it was unattainable owing to the customs of my native land. For those who understand many languages are not held in esteem amongst us. Those only are accounted wise who have knowledge of the law, and can expound the Holy Scriptures by word and by signification."

But the joy of the school in such a pupil did not last long. He soon grew weary of their disputations over difficult passages and their exercises in the seven rules of interpretation, and joined the Sadducees, with whose leading families he was connected by descent. His object was undoubtedly to gain some high office in the temple, to which his birth entitled him. By disposition, then, and from these beginnings, the son of Matthias appeared to resume the regular career of a high-born member of the priestly caste; but time brought with it that wonderful

[1] Jos. Vita, 1, 2.

[2] Josephus' attachment to the school of Hillel follows from his opposition to the strictness of the Pharisees and the harshness of the Zealots (Shammaites); but most clearly from his conception of the law of marriage, Ant. iv. 8, 23.

[3] Vita, 2. Perhaps used in Luke ii.

religious movement which repeatedly stirred the masses like a whirlwind, sometimes with the fear that the law was not fulfilled, sometimes with the illusion that Jehovah's wrath was to be more directly felt. Sometimes it would fall upon an individual soul with the craving for purity, the shrinking from the world, preached alike by Mosaic law and Alexandrian theosophy. A significant measure of its rising influence is, that this feeling could sweep an unimpassioned nature like Josephus' into its current. The young man turned away from the brilliant prospects that beckoned him on in Jerusalem, and went to satisfy his thirst for knowledge, as he says,[1] to one of those Essene colonies in the villages on the eastern declivities of the wilderness of Judah—communities which lived for the law, for asceticism, and for ceaseless trials of self.[2] This doubtless was the time when he made his way from his retreat at Engedi to the Dead Sea, as far as Jebel Usdum, and marvelled at Lot's wife in the fantastic form of the rock of salt beside the south-western outlet of the lake.[3] In later days he was to fill the world with romantic accounts of the horrors of this majestic but enchanting country, which he himself touched but superficially.[4] If as large deductions were made from his accounts of the Essenes as must be made from the romantic element in his descriptions of nature, these communities would appear in a much more sober light. Nevertheless, the impressions received here by Josephus were the very deepest of his life, and his description of the Essene community is at all events warmer in colour than is usual with him. He speaks with manifest respect of their principles of education, diet, and rule of life. In maturer years, the ideal of this order, which aimed at freeing the spirit from the dominion of sense by fasting, ablution, labour and prayer, still possesses something of grandeur in his eyes. Even at a time when he had dropped many other youthful illusions,

[1] Vita, 2. [2] Bell. iv. 8, 4. [3] Ant. i. 11, 4.

[4] E.g. from the conclusion of his description, Bell. iv. 8, 4, he seems not to have visited the valley of Siddim.

he still clung to the fundamental doctrine of the Essenes, that the soul has been dragged down to the material world from a better realm by creative attraction, and can only be released from the bondage of its prison by the slaying of sense.[1] The same principle determined the Essene theory of visions, which is a first step towards the liberation of the soul from the bonds of sense. Josephus himself claimed this gift so far as to believe that he could recognize and interpret the secret meaning of the divine voice in dreams.[2] In times of great peril, he set no little value on his visions in dreams; they appealed to him like real experiences.[3] Even the mysteries of the Book of Daniel were disclosed to him; and in matters of importance he would appeal to the passages of Scripture revealed to him, or to the dread figures of his dreams and solitary trances.[4]

There is no doubt that Josephus had acquired in the solitude of his Essene mortifications that gift of intuition which he employed in contemptible trickery during the period of his moral debasement. The teacher under whom he intended to pass his time of probation was Banus, an anchorite who enjoyed wide reputation for the strictest asceticism. He lived in the wilderness; his garments, even simpler than the camel's hair of the Baptist, were of bast; his food, of roots and wild herbs. That even temperature of mind and quenching of the sensual life which were the highest end of the Essenes, were secured by bathing in cold water, day and night. This new John of the wilderness was accounted one of the most advanced amongst the wise men of the order, whose inward eye was opened,[5] and Josephus appears to have been a disciple of his throughout his Essene career.[6] As to his doings and experience there, his mouth was for ever shut by the terrible vow of the order. He only speaks of "strict and severe practices and many trials laid upon him," comparing the monastic life of the brethren to that

[1] Bell. ii. 8, 11, vii. 8, 7; Ap. 2, 24. [2] Bell. iii. 8, 3. [3] Vita, 42.
[4] Bell. ii. 8, 12; iii. 8; 3, 9; iv. 6, 3; vi. 5, 4.
[5] Vita, 2. [6] Ibid.

of school-children under the life-long discipline of strict masters.[1] Nor does he forget how the elder brethren shrank from contact with a novice like himself.[2] Three years later he gave back paddle and apron to the Essenes, to rejoin the ranks of the patriots in Jerusalem in the year 56.

It is interesting to compare his life with the parallel development of the Apostle Paul. Both Paul and Josephus began as Pharisees in the schools of the Rabbis; both experienced an hour of higher illumination, which wrenched them from the beaten track and drove them into the wilderness. As Josephus by the Dead Sea, so Paul spent three years in Arabia. Both, while dwelling with the solitaries, knew the rapture of visions and inward converse with the spirit. But in Paul's case, higher enlightenment was to be enfranchised from the law; in Josephus', to be hardened in it. In the period of his highest patriotic aspirations he remained a Pharisee, no less than in the later period of utter decline. His highest ideal of virtue is fidelity to the law, keeping the ordinances about meats, whether widespread famine or scanty prison fare is the trial of piety;[3] fidelity to the law, though the tempter's bait be the fillet of the high-priest.[4] Yet the dignity of high-priest is the ultimate goal of his ambition; five times happy in his eyes is Annas the murderer of Jesus, in that his five sons wore the holy vestments.[5] His judgments, therefore, not unfrequently recall the follies of a school which values most the gold in the temple, and continually say, It is Corban, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me. It is bad enough for traitors to open the gates of beleaguered Jerusalem to the foe; but much worse for them to use the sacred saws of the temple for this purpose. He is unmoved, therefore, if the Zealots let their brethren starve; but his indignation knows no bounds when they seize the shewbread in the temple.[6]

[1] Vita, 2; Bell. ii. 8, 4.
[2] Bell. ii. 8, 10.
[3] Ant. iii. 15, 3; Vita, 3.
[4] Ant. xix. 6, 4.
[5] Ant. xx. 9, 1.
[6] Bell. iv. 4, 6, v. 9, 4.

His teachings in the wilderness, then, had not given him a mystical depth of thought, but had merely confirmed him in his outward and material views. For the same reason he never took the final binding vows of the Essenes. He was of too vehement and ambitious a temperament to subside into the quietism of monastic existence and dream away his life in one of these colonies. He would be of some account in the world; his ambition was that his country should have to reckon with his will. Yet by this time his theological bent was so firmly established, that instead of attaching himself to the Sadducees, as might be expected from his family connections and personal prospects, he rejoined the Pharisees to lend them his vigorous aid in their struggle for the purity of the land, the observance of the law, and the preparation of the people for the Messianic kingdom. He himself afterwards found it convenient to pass over this period of his life; but his opponent, Justus of Tiberias, chose an awkward moment to recall the fact that Josephus had at that time been amongst the most zealous Pharisees and the most imperious foes of Rome. But this patriotic mood did not last long. He returned from the wilderness in the first year of Felix; by the death of Festus, we find him already on the side of the peace party. The cause of this sudden change was, that meanwhile he had occasion to learn the power of Rome, and henceforward believed in the possibility of a theocratic state under Roman suzerainty.

Josephus was twenty-four years old when, in the year 61,[1] he visited Rome. We have seen him before, in Paul's prison at Cæsarea, tending those priests who lived on nuts and figs, and would not eat or even touch the unclean food of the Gentiles. To plead their cause, he took ship to Rome. The storms of the year 61 are known to us from the Apostle's voyage. Paul's ship was wrecked at Malta; Josephus' foundered in mid-Adriatic. Of six hundred passengers, only eighty managed to keep above

[1] Not 63, the date, indeed, given in Vita, 3. One of Felix' transports of prisoners must have reached Rome in the autumn of 61 at latest.

water until they were picked up at daybreak by a passing ship of Cyrene. Prisoners and escort landed that same autumn at Puteoli, with the loss of everything but life; Paul wintered at Malta. At Puteoli, Josephus made the acquaintance of the Jewish actor Aliturus, who was in high favour as a mime at Nero's court. The Jewish artist took charge of his countrymen, and introduced Josephus to Poppæa, who, being a proselyte of the gate, enjoyed the society of learned Jews. This influential lady was pleased with the young Oriental. Not only did she effect the release of the imprisoned priests, but gave him other signal marks of favour. Having executed his commission, Josephus returned home, laden with splendid gifts from his illustrious patroness.[1] He had now seen the might of Rome with his own eyes, and found the Jewish law honoured at court; it was possible to conclude that he had gone too far in the last five years' resistance to the procurator.

He had thus reached the attitude of uncertainty to which a policy of mediation not unfrequently leads. Too good a Pharisee to support the Romans, he was yet too well informed to believe in the dreams of the Zealots. But instead of feeling the weakness of his situation, vanity led him to imagine that the Jews, to whom he thought himself superior, could not possibly do without him, and that the Romans, whom he now knew, must thank him for his moderation and try to come to an understanding with him and others who thought with him. He was doubly incensed, and naturally, because Albinus and Florus began their most crying injustice with the moderate party, and leagued with the Assassins and Zealots to give up the propertied classes to plunder.[2]

This appearance of the governor naturally injured his designs of mediation. He found every consideration of honour and

[1] His absence lasted apparently during the whole of Festus' government, which is described very incompletely both in Bell. ii. 14, 1, and Ant. xx. 8, 9.

[2] Bell. ii. 14, 9, where Josephus specially calls the *μέτριοι* his friends.

faith on the side of war. Such was the ambiguous situation in which he was overtaken by the events of 66. Intimidated by the clamour of the insurrection, he had withdrawn with his friends into the temple and quietly performed the duties of his office, perceiving that the excitement of the populace would regard all further compromise as treason. It was not until Eleazar, son of Simon, had got rid of Menahem the Zealot, that he and his friends thought it time to seize the reins of power, with the intention of restoring them amicably to the Romans. But once in power, they found to their horror that Eleazar, on whom they counted, was no better than the son of Judas the Galilean, whom he had murdered.[1]

Urged forward against their will, their one wish at last was for the proconsul to save them without delay from their revolutionary position and suppress the insurrection. At the approach of the Syrian troops, the gates were opened to the Romans with their connivance. Great was their secret delight when the lower town was occupied by the Romans; but greater their terror when Cestius suddenly broke up camp and began to retire towards Antipatris. Amid the general rejoicings at the defeat of the Romans, it was more impossible than ever to propose peace, especially as popular fury was intensified by tidings of the massacre of Jews in Egypt, Syria, Phœnicia and the Decapolis. Nothing, therefore, was left to the aristocracy but to carry through the part they had so imprudently assumed. They restricted themselves perforce to giving all places of influence to their own friends, and sending as many of the Zealots as possible to distant posts.

Our hero received no less important a task than the defence of Galilee. His vanity could not resist the offer of such a command. If he went over to Agrippa, he was nothing; if he remained, he was general, governor, and soon, perhaps, higher still. Too young to reject such a temptation, he was yet keen enough to recognize its danger. From the first day, therefore,

[1] Bell. ii. 17, 10.

it was his care to secure his retreat and maintain his communications with partizans in the other camp.[1] Under these circumstances, his fidelity was very doubtful; but apart from this, it was an inconceivable mistake to entrust the defence of Galilee to his hands. Josephus had never seen war; he had grown up in scholastic disputation and party wrangles, and had but just completed his twenty-ninth year.[2] The Sanhedrin might give him a command, but could not make a soldier of him. As governor of Galilee, too, he was no more than a student of the law; at every step the robe of the Pharisee showed its broad hems and long phylacteries beneath the general's cloak. Worse still; instead of supporting him with soldiers of experience, they merely gave him the assistance of two priests. A Pharisee and two priests were the leaders sent to oppose the Roman legions at the most important point of the theatre of war.

---

3. The War in Galilee.

To expect that Josephus, the son of Matthias, would henceforth devote his entire energies to preparation for war, was to show very imperfect knowledge of the way in which the leaven of Pharisaism corrupted even the acutest intellects. There was much else for Josephus to do in Galilee than to organize the armament of the assembled nation and seek for alliances. The man had been transformed from a student of the law to a viceroy in a single night; what the Rabbi dreamed of yesterday, the statesman would realize to-day. While the Roman legions gathered to north and to south, he proceeded to establish the Pharisee's model state in Galilee, and re-cast every arrangement, great or small, according to his own ideal. The Mosaic council of elders was copied in a supreme council of seventy elders in Galilee, whose powers the youthful legislator carefully con-

[1] Vita, 35, 26.

[2] He was born in 37.

sidered and limited. In every town he set up a college of seven, whose duty it was to decide disputes of slighter importance. Capital cases and weightier questions of law might not be settled without his consent. In brief, his one care was the realization of the ideal Mosaic state in great and small, as if it were a time of profound peace. He made a survey of the splendid buildings of Tiberias, not with a view to their capabilities for defence, but to discover whether they contained images contrary to the Decalogue. He inspected the storehouses in town and country, to see, not whether they contained sufficient supplies, but whether the oil was Levitically pure, and prepared so as to satisfy the requirements of the Jewish law.[1]

While he was intent on these Pharisaic objects, his two colleagues governed from the Levitical point of view. He was heart and soul for the model state of the Pharisees; they found the exaction of the priestly tithes all-important. It was long since the country had been tithed; so they boldly filled their purses, and, soon growing rich, informed Josephus that they would now lay down the government of Galilee and return home. They were with difficulty persuaded to devote their valuable services to the country a little longer.

While each thus followed his political inclinations, little was done in preparing for war. In part, the time was wasted in empty bustle and unpractical diversions; in part, partizan measures were adopted, which merely betrayed how much more the ruler of Galilee hated his political adversaries than the approaching enemy. Disliking the conduct of the Zealots, he organized his army from the more reliable elements of society, and looked with great scorn upon his opponents,[2] who had formed free companies of youthful dare-devils and highwaymen who knew the country.[3] But these "robbers," as he calls them, stuck to their posts when his more tractable Galileans fled by whole regiments at the first news of the Roman advance. These

[1] Bell. ii. 21, 2; Vita, 13.

[2] Bell. ii. 21, 2.

[3] For the gathering of the multitude of Trachonitis, cf. Bell. iii. 10, 10.

troops, he tells us himself, were perforce left untrained, because time pressed. In place of training, he mimicked all the forms of the Roman army—he had indeed been in Rome; he appointed corporals, centurions and tribunes, instructed them in watch-words and bugle-calls, and above all he kept a quantity of fine phrases, the meaning of which he is careful to tell us. On the Sabbath, the whole army used to disperse and spend the day of rest at home.[1] The general himself shared in these recreations. He revelled in the beauties of the neighbourhood, which offered a pleasant contrast to Jerusalem; and it was said that the fair women of Galilee were not safe from him.[2] These were but the diversions of an amateur, who knew war from books and parades: useless, but not harmful. They might have been overlooked, had he not further wasted the best strength of his country in civil war instead of concentrating it for defence.

Josephus had not come to Galilee as the herald of a new freedom. He found parties there already organized, and led by men who enjoyed great respect. They were not great politicians, celebrated scholars, nor brilliant writers, like Josephus; far from it, they were for the most part men of obscure origin, half robbers, half shepherds; freebooters in war, and in peace mere sheep-stealers, footpads and such-like. But they understood war, and had more than once crossed swords with the Roman cohorts.

They were headed by the petty local leaders, such as every village produces in time of trouble—John of Gishala, Jesus of Tiberias, Justus of Tiberias, and so forth. These men at first made friendly advances towards the new governor, but they soon saw through the utter hollowness and incapacity of the man who had been sent to them from Jerusalem. Now when the latter, so far from punishing the Romanizing city of Sepphoris, granted it free access to the coast; when he endeavoured to make over to his political friend Agrippa and his sister a caravan which had been carried off by a skirmishing party;

[1] Bell. ii. 21, 8; Vita, 32. [2] Bell. iii. 10, 7, 8.

when, again, he kept back for secret purposes the material of war which ought to have been devoted to strengthening the border fortresses.—then all Galilee rang with the cry that Josephus was a traitor, and meant to deliver the country to the Romans. One morning in Tarichæa, the governor was all but burnt alive by a raging mob which besieged his house, and only escaped, thanks to the humility with which he begged for mercy, in the guise of a malefactor, and the adroitness with which he played off one party against another. He afterwards cooled his rage upon several who had taken part in the riot, and had them cruelly mutilated: but it was a weak revenge for his disgraceful humiliation. Even at Tiberias he was soon forced to flee out into the lake before the swords of the Zealots, and nothing but the favour of the orderly citizens and peasants, who always prefer peace to war, made his further stay possible.

In Jerusalem, meanwhile, where the friends of Josephus had been playing the same game with incomparably worse results, it seemed necessary to recall the incompetent governor of Galilee. He had long been protected by the high-priest Annas and his friends: but at length a bribe overcame their resistance. A commission was sent to Galilee with a military escort; at their head were Simon, son of Gamaliel, and Annas, charged to investigate the complaints of John of Gishala. News of this, sent by his father, suddenly ended Josephus' hesitation. He concentrated his forces and marched upon Ptolemais, where the Roman general Placidius had for weeks been burning Galilean villages. When the envoys arrived, it was impossible to recall the general from his camp under the very eyes of the Romans. He was too crafty to be brought over by stratagem; the commission therefore moved aimlessly through the province, and made the further discovery that the citizens of the war party were not nearly so bold as their leaders imagined. They were only well received in large towns like Gamala, Gishala and Tiberias, though, it may be, for different reasons. The peasantry, on the other hand, offered serious resistance. They dealt in oil with

Antioch, exported corn to Damascus, and sold cattle for sacrifice in Jerusalem. They were not the party for war at any price.[1] Under these circumstances, Josephus had no difficulty in getting together scores of Galileans to testify before the War-sanhedrin that his conception of his duty was marked by extraordinary energy, with the result that he caused a counter-revolution in Jerusalem itself, and the commission was simply recalled. Josephus now re-occupied the revolted towns; but the result of all these strokes and counter-strokes was that Tiberias had grown weary of the whole affair, and immediately after the governor's departure sent an embassy to king Herod Agrippa, inviting him to return to his country. Josephus was once more compelled to make a military expedition against Tiberias, and, after chastising the peace party, turned against Gishala to overthrow the war party there and give up the town to his followers for pillage.

As to the real object of his contradictory policy, Josephus afterwards maintains profound silence. At the moment, it is clear, he wished to make war, but to conduct it himself. As a preliminary, his adversaries were to be disarmed. In this he succeeded, crushing one insurrection after another, by the employment of force, assassination or fraud. But his success involved the loss of the whole winter, and the irreparable waste of time, strength and enthusiasm.

Without reading Josephus himself, it is impossible to believe the hypocrisy, fraud and bloodthirstiness, of which these men of God were capable, these who devoted themselves to fighting for their religion. They agreed upon a day of public humiliation in the synagogue of Tiberias, to acknowledge before God the futility of arms, because each party saw in it an opportunity of massacring the other unarmed. They sanctimoniously perform the holy rites and utter their prayers; and then, glancing at their neighbours, mutually discover that every man wears corslet and dagger beneath his penitent's robe.[2] They provide

[1] Bell. iv. 2, 1. [2] Vita, 56, 57.

the adjacent towns with pure oil pleasing to God, to sell for ten drachmas what they had requisitioned for one.[1] They perjured themselves in the most dread name of God, and broke their pledged word regardless of honour or loyalty.[2] Josephus displays great unction in devoting the plunder wrested from Agrippa to building the walls of Zion, and then restores it secretly to the king.[3] The "Lord" invariably appears to him in a vision when he meditates a special act of folly.[4] He entices his enemies to his house with the most sacred oaths, only to fling them out again with maimed limbs,[5] or lures them into a dungeon with friendly words.[6] It is impossible to guess at the full moral depravity of Pharisaism before hearing all this told by the priest and prophet himself.

Meanwhile, the proceedings in Galilee were repeated elsewhere by Josephus' friends: about Lydda and Joppa by the Essene John, and in Idumæa by the high-priest Jesus ben Sapphia, and Eleazar the son of Ananias. After wasting precious time, they ventured to assault Ascalon early in 67; but the Romans outflanked their ill-led masses, and inflicted on them so crushing a defeat that 10,000 Jews were left on the field. Nor was anything effected elsewhere, as is clearly shown by the advance of the Romans.

Vespasian and Mucianus probably entered Syria in the earlier months of the year 67. Besides the two Roman legions, Vespasian found king Agrippa ready there with his contingent, and immediately advanced upon Ptolemais to unite with the forces of his son Titus, who was marching up from the south. Josephus skirmished with the king's advanced guard at the lake, and, losing a battle simply through want of skill in riding, reached Jesus' city, Capernaum, with a sprained wrist; meantime, the union of the armies took place, without the commander of Galilee so much as attempting to prevent it. As Titus brought up the fifth and tenth legions, twenty-three cohorts and six

[1] Vita, 13. [2] Vita, 20; 33; 34. [3] Vita, 26.
[4] Vita, 42. [5] Vita, 30. [6] Vita, 63.

squadrons of cavalry, and, moreover, contingents had arrived from the vassals Antiochus of Commagene, Sohem of Emesa, and Malichus of Arabia, Vespasian had an available force of 60,000 men, which had grown up under his command against very different enemies.

The bulk of the army proceeded along the high road from Acco to Damascus, and it became Josephus' duty to attack these troops with his militia. In after days he remarked upon the impression of terror which the advance of the legions and the appearance of a really disciplined army made upon the minds of the Jews. It was not, indeed, the first time that the short swords of the Romans crossed the curved sabres of the Jews; but the same scene is repeated in the first as in the last war. On the side of the Romans, all is order, precision and discipline. The camp moves from place to place like an advancing fortress. Behind its rampart is a city in miniature—regular streets, with the prætorium in the midst. Daily routine apportioned to each his successive duties; every man knew without asking what he had to do at each hour. The sound of the trumpet gives the signal for all to rise, to work, to rest, to sleep. At the first signal the tents are struck; at the second, packed up; at the third, the standing buildings are given to the flames to prevent them from being of service to the enemy. Then the mighty host moves slowly forward in symmetrical lines, like a great spider. The individual shows the same orderliness in taking his place in the maniple, as the maniple in the cohort, and the cohort in the legion. The whole army is no more than a vast machine moving at the sole thought of the general.

How great the difference from what Josephus was accustomed to in his own camp, and from what we have seen before in Pompey's wars against the Jews! For disciplined warriors, we have an unpractised multitude.[1] In place of strict subordination to a single will, we have a hundred lawyers who search the law for rules of military conduct, whose chief pre-occupation

[1] Bell. iii. 10, 2, ii. 10, 1.

it is to discover sources of impurity which might provoke the wrath of Jehovah, and who fix favourable and unfavourable days, and forbid any fighting on the Sabbath.[1] On the one side, the measured tramp of the patrol; on the other, the monotonous chant of psalms; with the Romans, the watch-fires of the bivouac: in Jerusalem, the columns of smoke above the burnt-offering; orderly foresight and tactical skill opposed to theological strategy, which gave up its best positions on the Sabbath, and was often occupied in acts of ritual, in ablutions and sacrifices, while Roman catapults and ballistas swept the field with stones and firebrands, or stood unmoved beside the altar, while the enemy breached the walls.

Such were the memories that took vivid shape in the mind of Josephus, when the news came upon him like a thunderbolt that Sepphoris, the occupation of which had been the first demand of the Zealots, had gone over to the Romans. The latter now established a strong camp beneath the walls of the city so well fortified by Josephus, and had a footing in the heart of Galilee. But Josephus did not stir. He still professed to await the opening of negociations by the Romans before definitely unfolding his programme.[2] Instead of this, Placidus' cavalry attacked the strangely inactive general, and compelled him, indeed, to attempt to storm Sepphoris; but this first engagement ended in total discomfiture.

Placidus now meditated a *coup de main* on Jotopata, a fortress north of Lake Gennesareth; but here, happily, Josephus was not in command. The attack failed, and Placidus was forced to retreat. But now at last Vespasian advanced from Ptolemais with the main army, and made a strong camp on the frontier of Galilee. The news of this struck panic into the Jewish army. The valiant Galileans fled by regiments. The general who had given the preference to this army above the bands of Zealots, at length was left before the treacherous Sepphoris, deserted by all but a few faithful followers. Then

[1] Bell. iv. 2, 3.

[2] Bell. iii. 7, 2; Vita, 7.

he, too, fled in haste to Tiberias, and thence sent to Jerusalem for further instructions. He was still perfectly confident that the Romans would open negociations with him. But as the Sanhedrin sent no army, and Vespasian no herald, Tiberias in turn became untenable. On 21st May, 67, the governor of Galilee entered Jotopata as a fugitive.[1] A few days later, Vespasian was before the city with the Roman army.

Josephus prefaces his account of the siege of Jotopata with the general remark that nothing gives so much courage in war as necessity. It must be admitted that his defence of the fortress bears out this axiom. Set on a steep ridge of rock, and surrounded by deep ravines, the town was only accessible on the side of the mountain. The first assault of the Romans lasted from morning till evening, and convinced them that a regular siege was impracticable. The Jews were inspired with no little confidence. As usually happens in war, they had got over their first alarm and cared no more for the flying darts and bullets.

The Romans, following their cautious practice, began siege-works. The woods disappeared from the surrounding heights, and in their place certain bastions rose at intervals about the city walls, each crowned with a piece of Roman artillery. Shot whistled from the catapults; stones from the ballistæ hurtled through the air and crashed heavily upon the city. And now the walls were no longer able to resist the bombardment. The Jews plucked up courage—rushed amongst the engines, flung down the sappers, and burnt the works which had taken so much labour to construct. Undaunted, the Romans rebuilt them; but this time they filled the intervening space with a continuous wall, so that further sallies were impossible.

Nothing remained for Josephus but to raise the city wall to rival the Roman works. He stretched out wet hides which deadened the impact of the shot; behind these the Jews proceeded to build, until the walls rose twenty cubits higher.

[1] Bell. iii. 6, 1, seq.

Vespasian saw that further attack was fruitless, and resolved to reduce the town by famine. He could, indeed, see from his camp how at stated hours the garrison brought water to the market-place in barrels, whence he concluded that the town had no living springs. As it was, Josephus was now compelled to reduce the rations, and, as always happens when the people are unable to drink when they want, they believed they were perishing of thirst. If the Romans actually waited till the cisterns were exhausted, the fall of the town was inevitable; Josephus therefore ordered his followers to deceive the enemy by soaking their clothes in water and hanging them on the wall, so that the water should run down from them in streams. It was a painful stratagem for the thirsty Jews, but it succeeded. The Romans were taken in and proceeded to a new assault.

Yet even so Josephus felt that the days of Jotopata were numbered. He prepared to fly with some of the leaders, and leave the town to its fate. Unfortunately, the Jews got wind of his design: and though he put on all the dignity of a general, and explained that to save the city he must organize an army in Galilee, the garrison clamoured for him to stay in a way that admitted of no refusal. So he remained, and undertook several vigorous sallies, which, however, failed to check the advance of the Roman works. The Roman rampart came nearer and nearer to the Jewish walls. At length the fearful moment arrived when it was near enough for the battering-ram to be erected. The heavy beam was slung on a stout rope; its point provided with a ram's head of bronze. Strong hands pull it back: then the terrible beam is launched against the wall, battering unceasingly upon the same place. The heavy blows repeated themselves with awe-inspiring monotony, resounding over the whole city. Women and children rushed out of the houses, weeping and wailing with terror, for there was none so young but knew what this battering meant.

Then Josephus had sacks filled with chaff, and when the

monster prepared to charge, the Jews hung the sacks before it, and the thud of the bronze head was spent ineffectually upon their elastic contents. But the Romans cut away the sacks with long sickles; the ram began again, and the wall crumbled away bit by bit into the valley beneath. Then the Jews made a desperate sally and fired the engine. They saw from the city with savage joy the flames roll round their dreaded foe. One of the active Galileans seized a piece of rock in both arms, and flung it with such force as to break off the head of the engine and send it rolling into the hollow beneath. Not content with this, he sprang down into the midst of the enemy, seized the trophy, and ran with it up the mountain-side, regardless of the shot. Five darts pierced him through; but he gained the battlements in triumph. Then at last he fainted with pain, and fell back into the ravine with his trophy. What might not have been effected with such soldiers under other leadership?

But fate was not to be averted by simple deeds of valour. In spite of sharp fighting—Vespasian himself was wounded—the embankment was restored. A new ram was erected; and though the Jews could stop its dreadful work by day, night prevented them from seeing at what point it was directed. As they held torches here or there, one after another was struck down into the depths by the enemy's shot. It was almost a relief when, on the thirty-sixth day, the Romans at length advanced from the siege to an assault. Josephus cleared the streets of all idlers, and gave his soldiers the very practical command, which he must have read in his Odyssey, to stop their ears so as not to be alarmed by the war-cry of the legions.

So they awaited the attack. As the leading cohorts advanced through the breach, the Jews poured boiling oil upon them. Their scalded limbs gave way beneath them, and, rolling in agony on the ground, the enemy fell back into the ravine. When the oil was exhausted, they flung boiling fenugreek upon the mantlets, so that the storming party, as they came up, slipped

upon the charred bodies of their predecessors. It was a day of vengeance for the Jews. At nightfall, Vespasian was compelled to draw off his hardly-handled troops without effecting anything.

So they fell back upon constructing new engines. But by this time the strength of the garrison was exhausted. The excessive strain was succeeded by universal lassitude. A deserter informed the enemy's general that even the sentinels succumbed to sleep in the early hours of morning. It was the forty-seventh day of the siege when Vespasian resolved to surprise the citadel itself, where an assault was least provided for. The troops marched out after midnight. Titus and the tribune Domitius Sabinus were the first to climb the wall. They cut down the sentries and entered the town in silence. Then the citadel was occupied without a sound.

The town was wrapped in leaden sleep; a mist, too, delayed the break of day. When light came at last, the citizens saw dense columns of the Romans pouring down from the citadel. A fearful hand-to-hand conflict ensued in the streets; but before long the Jews were either dispersed into their houses or driven over their own walls. On the second day began the slaughter and pillage in the houses. The men were put to the sword, the women and children made prisoners and driven into the camp. The governor of Galilee had disappeared; not a trace of him was to be found either among the dead or among the prisoners.

Josephus had taken advantage of the confusion to leap into a cistern, whence a side passage led into a spacious cave, invisible from above. Here he found forty fugitives, who had laid up ample store of provisions. All day they sat quiet in anxious expectation; at night they crept out in the city one by one, and tried to steal away. Josephus went up more than once, but did not succeed in eluding the guards. Then on the third day a woman was taken who had visited the party in hiding. To save herself, she betrayed the governor's hiding-place. Vespasian sent two tribunes to the cistern and bade them summon Josephus to come forth, on promise of his life. But no one

stirred. A second emissary, a friend of Josephus, was able to convince him that it was no idle promise. The soldiers had grown impatient, and were about to fling fire into the cavern when Josephus consented. But now a great tumult arose within the cavern. The men drew their daggers and threatened Josephus with instant death if he stirred from his place. In vain did he employ his authority as general; in vain assumed the Essene prophet and appealed to divine revelations; in vain uttered philosophic phrases about the wickedness of suicide, a sin unknown to beasts, about the mysterious bonds uniting body and soul, and the law of nature which has implanted the instinct of self-preservation; the Jews cried furiously: "Verily the laws of our fathers will groan heavily over thee, to hear that thou goest up of thy free will as a slave into the light of day." Nothing was left for him but to acquiesce in his fate.

Death stared him in the face. Below, provisions were running short: above, the Roman sentries paced to and fro. At last he snatched at a desperate resource. He rose and declared that if they must die, they should at least die gloriously. Let them cast lots which should kill his fellow, the survivor should take his own life. His plan met with approval. The first man named stabbed his neighbour, and then offered his breast to the next. One fell after another in mutual destruction, till at length only Josephus and one companion were left upon the heap of dead. He would have us believe that it was not himself, but Providence, that arranged the lots. This does not add to the credibility of a somewhat incredible story. But be it as he will, he succeeded, according to his own account, in persuading his sole companion to live, and the pair came forth from the hideous cavern to the light of day. Here the tribune Nicanor waited to take him through the curious soldiery to Vespasian. The whole camp was in confusion when the man, to whom all ascribed the desperate defence of Jotopata, passed by as a prisoner. Some gazed at him in wonder; others indignantly demanded his death. The intercession of the kind-hearted Titus,

and the desire, perhaps, to send the governor of Galilee to Rome as a trophy of war, determined Vespasian to mercy.

But Josephus had no wish to go to Rome. He therefore adopted the method he always tried in desperate situations. He assumed the Essene prophet, and taking advantage of his Oriental costume, which invariably produced a mysterious effect upon the credulous Italians, demanded a private audience of the legate, for he had a message from Heaven to deliver him. All withdrew but Titus; whereupon Josephus, with all the impressiveness of Old Testament prophecy, announced to the general that Nero would not survive the end of the war, and would be succeeded on the throne by Vespasian and Titus. Vespasian took the prophecy at its real value, and asked ironically, why he had not foreseen the fall of Jotopata if he were really a prophet. In reply, Josephus was able to appeal to the prisoners; they could tell that he had foretold this too.[1] Vespasian, superstitious as he was, did not know what to make of the story. Meanwhile, he sent his prisoner to the baggage-train, where, for the rest, he was not badly treated.[2]

The exhaustion of the army and the approaching hot season forbade anything further of importance from being attempted. The army marched to Ptolemais, and thence to Cæsarea. On their entry, the populace furiously demanded the death of Josephus. Vespasian, however, paid no attention, and Josephus remained a prisoner in the camp, and soon made himself useful to his new master by betraying his country's secrets to the enemy, against whom he ought to have defended this country. Vespasian rewarded him with better treatment, and, as his wife had remained in Jerusalem, gave him one of the captive women in marriage. The young Jewess, however, had no liking for the

[1] According to Pirke Aboth de R. Nathan, ch. iv., Midrash Kohelet, ed. Frankf. 64, Gittin, 56, &c., it was inferred from Is. x. 35, that only a crowned sovereign could break the temple (Lebanon). On this ground Johanan ben Zac. also prophesied the throne to Vespasian.

[2] Cf. Dio Cass. 66, 1; Suet. Vesp. 5.

politician. She ran away from him when he went to Alexandria with the Romans. Soon after, Vespasian, with a portion of his troops, accepted Agrippa's invitation to Cæsarea Philippi, at the foot of Hermon, where a stay of twenty days was made. This, according to Agrippa and Bernice's plan, was to be the occasion of restoring stability to the tottering throne of the Herods, and the family devoted a part of their property to winning over the men who held the reins of power.[1] Titus, who was in the radiant bloom of manhood, and whose soldierly bearing, joined to amiable vivacity, his contemporaries found irresistible,[2] was won by Bernice, who became his devoted wife, and bound him closer and closer in her chains. At the same time she made herself acceptable to the avaricious Vespasian by the richness of her gifts.[3] Festivities began early in the morning; carousing and feasting lasted late into the night. Money, honour and Jewish customs, were all sacrificed by Bernice in the hope of maintaining the glory and power of her house. Agrippa, like his sister, was convinced that at the conclusion of the war the Romans would restore the kingdom and carry out their programme. In course of time, indeed, the Herods' treasury was exhausted. But the king covered his new expenditure by selling his subjects who had been given him by Vespasian from amongst the prisoners to do with as he would.[4]

While the natural protectors of the people were thus trafficking for the favour of the Roman generals, war was raging in Galilee. The pleasant highlands were strewn with ashes and ruins; the beautiful lake, in which Jesus found the image of peace and joy, was reddened with the blood of the Zealots. During the siege of Jotopata, the adjacent city of Japha was stormed on June 25th by Trajan, legate of the tenth legion, assisted by Titus, while the fifth legion stormed Gerizim and drove the Jews out of Samaria.[5] A flying column destroyed Joppa, and at the end of August, Vespasian concluded his

[1] Bell. iii. 9, 7. [2] Tac. Hist. v. 1. [3] Ibid. ii. 81.
[4] Bell. iii. 10, 10. [5] Ibid. iii. 7, 32.

summer holiday at Cæsarea Philippi, to terminate the war in the sultry vale of Gennesareth. First, Tiberias was taken; on Sept. 8th, Tarichæa was stormed by Trajan, father of the later emperor, while the Roman and national parties were fighting with one another in the very citadel. The Zealots fled to the open lake in the innumerable fishing-boats, but did not venture to land anywhere for fear of the Romans. By the next day, Vespasian's men had got rafts ready, and now the spectators on every bank saw a regular naumachy begin exactly as in the circus. A shower of stones from the Jews rattled harmlessly upon the heavy armour of the Romans. Afraid to run ashore anywhere, they were the more easily surrounded and sunk. It was a revolting sight on the following days, when swollen corpses came to the surface by hundreds, and spread pestilence far and wide upon the shore where Jesus once said: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

Next day these mouldering corpses were reinforced by a thousand more, for Vespasian ordered the prisoners to set out for Tiberias in the direction of Tarichæa. They fancied themselves free, and drew up in the Hippodrome ready to start. Suddenly the soldiers rushed in and put the old and crippled to the sword; the rest were either sold, or sent to the Isthmus to dig Nero's canal.

The only other place to offer serious resistance to the Romans was Gamala. Every attempt to induce the city to surrender peacefully was unsuccessful. King Agrippa, who rode up to the wall in hopes of negociating, was struck by a stone which almost shattered his arm.[1] An assault failed, and, as at Jotopata, the desired end was only obtained by a regular siege. Tabor, too, was strongly entrenched. But the city lying on a hill could not be concealed. Placidus, the general of horse, whose squadrons could not attack the mountain, drew the garrison into the plain by fair promises, whereupon the inhabitants

[1] Bell. iv. 1, 3.

surrendered, their water-supply having run out.[1] The longest resistance was offered by Gishala, where John, the prophet and leader of banditti, had inspired the populace with his own fanaticism.[2] When convinced that further defence of the now isolated hamlet was purposeless, the prudent leader deceived Titus by feigning readiness to surrender after the Sabbath, and used the delay to get off by night to Jerusalem, over whose destinies he was soon to exercise a fatal influence. With the fall of Gishala, the last stronghold of Galilee was crushed, and the army marched down into the plain to organize their advance upon Jerusalem from Cæsarea, Jamnia and Azotus.

---

4. The Fall of Jerusalem.

The news of the fall of Jotopata was received in Jerusalem with horror. Josephus was mourned as dead; but when it became known that the late governor of Galilee was safe and sound in Cæsarea, and that not as a Jewish prisoner, but a Roman spy, it did not need the arrival of John of Gishala to thoroughly embitter the populace against the leaders of the War-sanhedrin. Had not John of Gishala and every leader of the party of action constantly demanded the recall of the traitor while it was yet time?[3] Had not Eleazar, son of Simon, employed the proceeds of the spoils of Cestius in buying their favourite from the avaricious Annas and Jesus ben Gamaliel? Had not an embassy with 40,000 pieces of silver been sent to Galilee to secure the young fellow? Yet, after all, had not the chief men amongst them hindered the plans of the Zealots, Jesus ben Gamaliel invariably sending timely warning to Josephus through his father, so that he took corresponding precautions?[4] It can be understood that, after such experiences, con-

[1] Bell. iv. 1, 8.
[2] Ibid. iv. 2, 1.
[3] Vita, 38, 30.
[4] Ibid. 41.

fidence in the council of war was deeply shaken, and violent attacks and arbitrary arrests ensued. But Annas, the murderer of James, still thought it possible to play his treacherous part. While the people were amused with the noisy pretence of soldiering, over which Josephus himself makes merry,[1] secret preparations were made to hand over the city to Vespasian.

At this point the two parties came to blows over the redistribution of the chief offices. The chief-priest was still Matthew, son of Theophilus, who had received the holy fillet from the hands of the enemy, Agrippa II. It was but common sense to demand, as the war party did, the placing of another man in supreme office. But the aristocracy turned a deaf ear to the popular demand. Then Eleazar, the conqueror of Cestius, and the other men of action, appealed to the family of Eliakim, their only supporters among the priestly families, and made them draw lots for the high-priesthood.[2] The lot fell upon a country Levite, Phanias, son of Samuel, of the village of Aphta. The Sadducees shed tears of rage at the consecration of a peasant to be high-priest; and the Pharisees believed that the leaders had been seized with madness to have thus trampled the law underfoot.[3] Now since this change of high-priest struck a deadly blow at their influence, Annas and Jesus did not hesitate to plunge into civil war, with the avowed intention of admitting the Romans after they had overthrown the Zealots.[4] Annas in person called to arms, drove back the Zealots into the temple, and occupied the outer forecourt.[5] But the Sadducee could

[1] Bell. ii. 22, 1. [2] Eleazar, iv. 4, 1; the election, iv. 3, 6—8.

[3] Bell. iv. 3, 6—8.

[4] Ibid. iv. 3; 10, 14. Josephus naturally shields Annas and Jesus from the charge of treachery; but his own view is that Annas wished for peace. "He saw," says the valiant defender of Galilee, "that the Roman power was irresistible, and that the Jews must perforce be crushed if they did not make peace. In short, if Ananus had still been alive, a reconciliation would certainly have been effected, for his eloquence exerted a great influence over the people, and he had already won over most of those who were eager for resistance and war." Bell. iv. 5, 2.

[5] Bell. iv. 3, 12.

not bring himself to break in the holy portals of the stronghold. He also wished to duly purify the people from blood before entering the sanctuary of the inner forecourt. These priestly scruples lost him the battle. While the high-priests made ready their censers, the Zealots called the wild bands of Idumæans to their aid. John of Gishala admitted his savage allies into the city during one of those fearful storms only known in the south, when heaven and earth seem to totter. In order to let them in, the bolts of the gates were cut through, to Josephus' horror, with the holy saws of the temple.

Then began a massacre such as might be expected from a half-savage tribe. Annas and Jesus were seized and killed. The chieftains of the savages trampled on the corpses, which were left naked in the street for dogs and wild creatures to tear. So died the murderer of James, dragging hundreds with him to destruction. Heaps of unburied bodies lay about the public places; mourning filled the whole country.[1]

Another prominent member of the temple aristocracy, the wealthy Zacharias, son of Baruch, was brought by the Jews before a Sanhedrin assembled by them in the temple-synagogue. The evidence of treachery was insufficient, and the judges acquitted him. Instantly two assassins fell upon him and stabbed him, with the words, "Here is our voice for you," while the rest drove the judges out of the temple with the flat of their swords.[2] Weary of slaughter, the Idumæans at length retired; but now the Zealot leaders began to quarrel among themselves. It was not long before the troops of Eleazar came to blows, and shot one another down with the artillery constructed against the Romans.

Josephus saw with horror from Cæsarea how the punishment

[1] Cf. Bell. iv. 5, with Rev. xi., which is clearly written under the influence of these events.

[2] This is the scene to which some refer Matt. xxiii. 35, Luke xi. 51, where the Zacharias of 2 Chron. xlii. 20 is meant. The only question possible is whether the name of Barachias, instead of Jehoiada, given to the father of Zacharias, is not a reminiscence of our son of Baruch.

he merited was carried out upon his party. Words fail him to denounce this waste of strength; but was not he himself the first to begin this game? Was it not his own treachery that provoked this terrible catastrophe of popular passion? He paints all the Zealots' abominations in glaring colours; but this does not whitewash his own shame. The worst charges we bring against his adversaries are not the things which he complains of most: as, that they turned out their elders from their seats and elevated men without name or lineage;[1] that on work-days they ate forbidden meats and neglected the legal ablutions;[2] that John used the wood of the altar for engines of war,[3] and his men traversed the temple-court without purification;[4] that, when in the extremity of famine, the soldiers in despair gnawed leather, and one woman devoured her own child, the holy oil and wine of sacrifice in the temple were also distributed.[5] What we find most dreadful in the history of those days is, that when once the seed of suspicion was sown, when it was whispered in every corner that treachery was at work, mistrust did not rest alone where it was deserved, but the habit of civil war worked further, and soon Zealots raged furiously against Zealots. This was the seed sown by Josephus; but he was an incurable Pharisee, and instead of smiting his breast and crying, "Lord, be merciful to me a sinner!" he pointed the finger of scorn at men who ate unclean meats and did not wash their hands at stated hours.

Meanwhile, the state of the city went from bad to worse. Eleazar, the conqueror of Cestius, and John of Gishala fought in the temple and defiled the sanctuary with daily conflicts. The citizens called in to protect them a captain of banditti, from near Acrabbim, Simon bar Giora, who occupied Zion, and undertook a regular siege of the Zealots in the temple. This put the crowning touch to the misery of Jerusalem. It was not only wild sectaries, like the assailants of the Christian churches, who thought the days of the last tribulation had come,

[1] Bell. iv. 3, 7. [2] Ibid. vii. 8, 1. [3] Ibid. v. 1, 5.
[4] Ibid. vi. 2, 21. [5] Ibid. v. 13, 6.

written of in the book of Daniel, when the abomination of desolation should be set up in the holy place;[1] the very priests, laying their finger on the ninth chapter of Daniel, proved that the last enemy had come, for the sanctuary was defiled as in the day of Epiphanes.[2] The Zealots, however, ridiculed the folly of those who believed in any promise but that of the sword. Thereupon the devout resolved to quit the city in which the prophets were laughed to scorn, and the tabernacle of God among men defiled with blood.[3] Besides, the question whether a city thus desecrated could count on Jehovah's protection, lay heavy upon the minds of those who remained.[4]

Vespasian naturally was delighted to see his enemies thus weakening themselves. He employed the winter of 67-68 in fortifying the captured towns, and early in the spring completed the investment of Jerusalem. While the city wasted its stores and ravened against its own flesh, he took Gadara, the capital of Peræa, early in the spring, so as to secure his rear. Then Idumæa was occupied and secured by entrenchments. Judæa was finally reduced by the capture of Jericho at the end of May, 68, and the capital was absolutely thrown upon its own resources. Vespasian had just returned to Cæsarea in order to deal the last blow from thence, when news came from Italy which could not fail to remind the Jews how easily Rome might have been beaten under other leadership. The messengers of ill reported disaster upon disaster. First Julius Vindex had revolted; then, on June 8th, Nero had perished by his own hand, and Galba seized the sceptre. The news brought the campaign to a standstill. Until commissioned by the new Cæsar, Vespasian could not continue the war without arousing suspicion. Hard as it was to sheathe the sword at this juncture, the legate forced himself to it. Titus made ready to convey his father's homage to the new Cæsar, and with him went king

[1] Matt. xxiv. 16. [2] Bell. iv. 6, 3.
[3] Matt. xxiv. 16; Rev. xii. 14, seq.; Bell. iv. 6, 3; Euseb. H. E. 3, 5.
[4] Bell. vi. 2, 1.

Agrippa, that Galba might confirm to him what Nero had promised.

Thus ensued an anxious pause, which gave the Romans repose, and the Zealots a period for new saturnalia. Breathless expectancy brooded over Asia, and engendered the strangest rumours, which the Apocalypse of John shows us in the form current among the Jewish Christians. This was the momentary respite immediately before the coming of the great judgment of which John speaks. The angels stood on the four corners of the earth and held the four winds, so that no leaf stirred, nor any wave; and another angel came from the east and sealed the saints on the forehead, so that they should be marked before the coming of the great judgment.[1]

The Roman world, on the other hand, was most concerned with Vespasian's incomprehensible submissiveness, the price of which many thought was to be the adoption of Titus by the childless Galba. Others mourned after Nero, "being cast down after the destruction of their merchandise and greedy of rumour." Nymphidius, the prætorian prefect, wishing to keep the troops under his standard, first gave out that Nero had fled to Egypt. Even when he revealed the truth, many continued to believe in the first report. Others looked for him among the Parthians. The terror of his return, audaciously made use of by intriguers, more than once traversed the whole empire. Anxious glances were turned to the Euphrates, which Vespasian, trusting to Nero's Parthian alliance, had denuded of troops. Indeed, the agreement was disregarded from the moment of the Cæsar's death; the outposts on either side immediately renewed the struggle, and skirmishing had already begun upon the Euphrates with varying fortune.[2] No one believed that Galba's reign would be long, least of all the city overflowing with Nero's soldiers. While they debated between Verginius Rufus, Mucianus and Vespasian, the legions of Upper Germany proclaimed Vitellius emperor in the first days of the new year. And now Otho rose

[1] Rev. vii. 1, seq.

[2] Cf. Tac. Hist. ii. 6, seq.

in Rome, supported by the prætorians. Galba, an old man of seventy-three, was cut down in the streets, and thus Vitellius and Otho stood opposed to one another with equal claims.

Titus had reached Corinth when he learned the great change in the situation. He was authorized to acknowledge Galba, but had no power to choose between Otho and Vitellius. He therefore turned back. The Roman nobles declared mockingly that he was urged home by longing for the lovely arms of Bernice.[1] Agrippa, on the other hand, continued his journey. If he could but secure the crown of Judæa, whether from Galba or Vitellius or Otho, the rest was of no consequence.

Titus sailed direct for Cæsarea by Asia Minor and Cyprus. When Cyprus came in sight, the son of Vespasian desired to inquire the future in the temple of the Paphian Venus. The priest of Aphrodite declared that he could only tell Titus the oracle of the goddess if all auditors withdrew. The young Roman left the temple with radiant looks. How much easier now to repeat Josephus' prophecy of two years before![2]

Vespasian received the news of Otho's elevation and Vitellius' rising before the return of his son. He took it with the calm of a politician who had grown gray in affairs. Without hesitation he summoned the legions and made them take the oath of allegiance to Otho. His example was followed by Mucianus. Then the battle of Bedriacum raised Vitellius to the throne which Otho had scarce ascended. Even this tidings failed to draw Vespasian from his waiting policy. He again proffered the oath of allegiance to his soldiers, and implored good fortune for Vitellius, but the soldiers listened in silence and did not take the oath. The aristocratic Mucianus, at the head of the Syrian legions, and the romantic Titus, the idol of the Roman soldiers, pressed him in secret to assume the empire himself. He, however, cast up the balance like a merchant: "reflected on his sixty years and the promise of his son's youth. In private undertakings one could limit the stake; whereas those who

[1] Hist. ii. 1. [2] Suet. Tit. 5 Tac. Hist. ii. 2

aim at empire have no alternative between the highest success and utter downfall."[1]

Coolly as he calculated in everything else, Vespasian's choice, strangely enough, was decided by astrology, the cabala and augury. Josephus had promised him the empire in Galilee; on Carmel the augur announced to him "many men and wide lands;" marvellous signs of his youth revived in him, and as afterwards when emperor he retained a Chaldæan to direct his counsels, so now he turned to dark arts.[2]

He was still negociating with Mucianus through Titus, when the troops grew weary of delay. They had long demanded indignantly whether the army of the west should monopolize the right of giving the empire a master. The soldiers gathered in knots: the boldest began to call upon Vespasian as Cæsar; the rest approved: and thus on July 3rd, 69, the aged general permitted himself to be acknowledged as imperator. The same thing had already taken place in Alexandria and Antioch.[3] The whole affair was settled in Berytus with Mucianus and Tiberius Alexander.

It was here that the new Cæsar called to mind the man who had first promised him the empire, but was still compelled to wear fetters for the sake of appearances. Josephus was summoned to the emperor's tent, and, at Titus' request, his chains were struck off with an axe, in token that the reproach of captivity was taken from him.

King Agrippa was overtaken by these events in the capital, yet, thanks to Bernice's speedy care, he received news of them before Vitellius,[4] and was enabled to quit Rome secretly and escape with all speed to Vespasian's camp, where his sister, the diplomat of the family, had already shown the value of the Herod's friendship by setting all her connections with the petty Syrian dynasts to work for the Flavii. Like Josephus, the

[1] Hist. ii. 74. [2] Dio Cass. lxvi. 1; Suet. Vesp. 25; Hist. ii. 78.
[3] Tac. Hist. ii. 79, 81; Suet. Vesp. 6.
[4] Tac. Hist. ii. 81.

royal brother and sister accompanied the new emperor to Alexandria and Antioch to share the celebration of his accession in all its pomp. Here Josephus was deserted by his wife; he consoled himself with another, who in her turn was afterwards false to him.

At Alexandria, Vespasian received news of Primus Antonius' victory at Cremona, which completed the destruction of the Vitellian party. It was in vain that honourable men, like the former centurion Julius Priscus, laboured to re-organize it. Vespasian's brother, indeed, perished in Rome, and the Capitol was given to the flames; but Antonius took the city after terrible street-fighting. The mob of soldiers dragged Vitellius to the Gemoniæ. "Yet I was your emperor," he cried to the tribune who cruelly struck and ill-treated him (20th Dec. 69).

Now at last Vespasian could call himself Cæsar, and the people of Alexandria acclaimed him in idolatrous adoration. He saw himself drawn into the fantastic movement of this childish Oriental world, which believes in miracles and sees miracles. Vespasian's strong faith had already been played upon in Judæa by a Jew named Eleazar, who used a root of Solomon's to drive out demons through the nostrils of the possessed, and forced them to overturn a vessel of water as they came out.[1] In Alexandria a blind man, well known in the city, and another with a maimed hand, approached the Cæsar and besought him to cure them, for so they had been bidden by the god Serapis. On their refusal to go away, physicians were called in, but they resigned the case to the gods. Then Vespasian moistened the eye with spittle, and set his heel upon the hand outstretched for the purpose. "The hand was instantly restored to its use, and the light of day again shone upon the blind."[2] After this, the Cæsar himself visited the temple of Serapis. There he suddenly beheld before him his

[1] Ant. viii. 2, 5.

[2] Cf. the synoptic accounts, Tac. Hist. iv. 81; Suet. Vesp. 87; Dio Cass. 66, 8.

freedman Basilides, who at that very hour was lying sick eighty miles from Alexandria. "Accipio omen," cried the Cæsar, as the vision faded, judging from the name Basilides that he, as his master, was now βασιλεύς.

Here, too, in addition to the Egyptian mystagogues, a famous magician of Asia Minor forced his way to the emperor—Apollonius of Tyana. He had healed the sick, raised the dead, uttered prophecies, told Tigellinus the truth, and performed many other marvels before which the multitude bowed down. He was to be seen in Vespasian's train; and later writers give a long account of the teaching, the oracles and tokens, which he vouchsafed to the Flavii.[1] While the ceremonial of the court awakened respect, the emperor's parsimony in spending was a reminder that Vespasian could not only believe, but calculate, and the Egyptians found a master in him before he left for Italy at the beginning of the year 70.[2]

The task of reducing Jerusalem was now allotted to Titus. The twenty-third legion, which afterwards was posted at Maintz and left numerous inscriptions at Castel, formed, with the third, the nucleus of his army.[3] It was intended that he should call up the twelfth from Syria, a legion distinguished for its peculiar hatred of the Jews; three legions were in Palestine already, including the tenth, famed for the masterly handling of their artillery.[4] In the train of Titus we notice Josephus, who was to show the young Cæsar the roads leading to Jerusalem, and the inevitable Agrippa, who held the remnants of his troops in readiness against the Holy City. Tiberius Alexander, Philo's nephew, had the special direction of the siege works. So much Jewish talent had sold itself to level the city of David with the ground.

Meanwhile, the ring of steel that encircled Jerusalem had not been broken. Nor did the country stir. Jerusalem had to rely upon itself. "It was," says Tacitus, "an operation, the difficulty and arduousness of which was due rather to the cha-

[1] Philostr. Apol. v. 27, seq.
[2] Suet. Vesp. 9.
[3] Cf. Dio, lv. 22.
[4] Bell. v. 6, 3.

racter of its mountain citadel, and the perverse obstinacy of the national superstition, than to any sufficient means of enduring extremities left to the besieged."[1] The base of operations was again Cæsarea, whence it was necessary to maintain the communications of the besieging army. On the other hand, the immediate centre of operations was the fortified camp placed by Vespasian between Jericho and Adida. From thence the tenth legion made its way towards the Holy City through the same gorge by which Jesus once had gone. They set up their famous artillery and engines upon the Mount of Olives; for which reason doubtless the author of the third Gospel makes Jesus stop at this point and weep over the city, exclaiming, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."[2]

While the tenth legion thus commanded the city on the east, the twenty-second and the third legions encamped on the north, with the fifth in reserve three stades to their rear. As soon as the army had thus taken up its position, there began all that barbarity of war which soon reduced the whole neighbourhood of Jerusalem to a desert. Josephus was painfully affected to see all the spots sacred to him from childhood falling a prey to the Vandalism of the soldiery. In a few days the olive-trees of Gethsemane and the groves of the royal tombs fell before the axe, the woods were hewn down far and wide, hedges and steadings converted into fascines, and every garden demolished to make the *vallum*. It was pitiful to behold. "None," says Josephus, "who had visited Judæa before, would have recognized the place; he would have proceeded on his

[1] Hist. ii. 4. [2] Luke xix. 41—44.

way to seek for Jerusalem." Yet this sight was not the only punishment of the false position to which the renegade Pharisee had brought himself, and which poisoned his friendship with Titus. Spite of this high protection, he played a pitiful part in the camp. At one moment fraternizing with the Roman officers, at the next spurned by them, he was indeed to be compassionated.[1] The Jews sought to seize him in order to tear him piecemeal: the Romans longed to crucify him as often as one of his plans turned to their disadvantage, or the information of the deserters, which he alone could interpret, was insufficient.[2] So he found all the terrors of the siege doubly terrible; more than once he sprang up from sleep in panic, because some unwonted noise made him imagine the Jews had broken into the camp:[3] more than once he was forced to beg Titus to spare him commissions which would infallibly have delivered him into the hands of the Jews.[4]

Titus burned with impatience to bring the war to a speedy conclusion, for the heir of the Flavian dynasty had much else to do than to take the last fastness of a conquered country.[5] His legions, too, were enraged at the superstitious confidence and certainty of victory among the Jews; and yet were themselves unable entirely to get rid of superstitious fears in battle with the self-same people.[6] The Messianic prophecy found believers even among their own ranks, and it came to pass that soldiers deserted to the impregnable city which was promised the sovereignty of the world.[7]

Yet matters were proceeding faster than Titus imagined. The first approaches were made on April 23rd; in a fortnight the first wall fell, and the second five days later. To intimidate the Jews, Titus now held a brilliant review. As far as the mountains, everything was a blaze of flashing helmets and shields. This proving of no avail, Josephus was charged to

[1] Bell. vi. 2, 1, v. 6, 2; Vita, 75; Contra Ap. i. 9. [2] Ap. 1, 9.
[3] Bell. v. 7, 1. [4] Ibid. v. 7, 4. [5] Hist. 5, 11.
[6] Ibid. 2, 4; 5, 13. [7] Dio Cass. lxvi. 5; Hist. 5, 13; Suet. Vesp. 4.

propose a capitulation to the besieged. He went far along the walls, seeking a place from which to make himself heard and yet be out of shot. At last he found a tolerably safe place and spoke of the powers given him by God; reminded his countrymen of the obedience and subjection of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; how the patriarch himself had suffered his wife to be taken from him by the Egyptian king without resistance; how the children of Israel had patiently borne four hundred years of bondage in Egypt; and how their ancestors had patiently left the ark of the covenant in the hands of the enemy. Had God not willed the Roman dominion, he would have instantly destroyed Pompey with his lightnings; but that he did desire it was proved by the miracle of the stream of Siloah, which contained three times as much water as before, now that it was in the hands of the Romans.

Seldom has a speaker addressed a more ungrateful audience from a more singular position. The Romans behind compelled him to remain on his perilous platform; the Jews in front flung stones and shot arrows at him, cursing him for a traitor. At last it was enough, and he was allowed to conclude, but only to be forced to repeat the scene after every considerable success. This, after all, was the right place for him, for what had the elegant orator looked for in war? The situation was one of bitter irony, but he did not feel it. Nay, he was fool enough to ascribe the daily stream of deserters, not to the stress of famine within the city, but to the influence of his fine speeches. At last, on one of these occasions, a flying stone struck him on the head, and at all events stopped the performance for a time. He was carried off for dead; and the city was jubilant that the traitor had met with his deserts. On receiving the news of his death, his own mother, who was in prison with many others of his party, said that she would rather know him dead than alive, as she could find no more joy in him.

Titus meanwhile cast about for more effectual measures than Josephus' oratory. Henceforward he crucified all the prisoners.

Five hundred were often nailed to the tree of martyrdom on a single day, and soon there was not wood enough nor space enough for this barbarous mode of waging war. At last, in the first days of July, the citadel of Antonia fell, and the temple became strategically untenable. But the Jews thought otherwise. All the abominations of the last weeks had failed to shake their confidence in Jehovah's succour. The suburbs lay in ruin: thousands of corpses tainted the air; famine crept from house to house. Some had given their whole substance for a bushel of wheat; a mother had eaten her own child. The prisoners hung mouldering upon the crosses that were set upon the holy hill. The deserters lay ripped up upon the field, for the Arabs had heard that the runaways had hidden jewels by swallowing them. Most monstrous things had happened, but no one had conceived it possible that the temple should fall.

But the friends of Agrippa who had joined the Romans were proportionately alarmed lest this last enormity should come to pass. Josephus entreated and besought John in daily conference to quit the temple and try the arbitrament of God on the open field. The Zealots scornfully replied that God had a better temple—the world. The existing temple they were in need of; yet this, too, Jehovah would not desert.

Leisurely still, Titus had the walls of Antonia demolished, and a level way prepared for storming the temple. When this had come close up to the wall, which once the high-priests had raised against Agrippa's too curious eyes, redoubts were once more raised to overtop it. Thus the Jews were not spared the pang of being forced to burn the north-western portico, which connected it with Antonia. The rest was destroyed by the Romans, so that soon a broad battle-field lay between the raised forecourt of the Israelites and Antonia. Single combats took place here every day, while the city suffered the torments of famine, and every man's hand was against his neighbour, till the 5th of August came round, the day on which Solomon's temple had been burnt by the Chaldæans. Once more the

struggle raged around the forecourt of the Israelites: the doors were on fire, as well as several porticoes. Then a soldier mounted on his comrades' shoulders and flung a firebrand through the golden window into the body of the temple. As the flames spread, the Jews uttered a cry of despair, and quitted their posts to save the temple. Thereupon the Romans rushed in, and a shower of fresh firebrands flew over the heads of the defenders. The dead were heaped high on the temple stairs when Titus reached the burning sanctuary; but as he gave orders to save it, a soldier set fire to the door under the hinges, so that every one was forced to hurry out of the temple.[1]

A heartrending cry of lamentation rose from the city as the columns of smoke went up. And now one portico after another was taken by the Romans. The soldiers pressed on over the smoking ruins. The most terrible moment was when the Romans reached the eastern porticoes. There a prophet had gathered more than 6000 men, for this was the final moment for the appearance of the Messiah. Women and children, too, had flocked together to behold the sign of the Son of Man. But instead, the Romans pressed on over the sacred forecourts and fired the portico, so that the hapless band came to a miserable end.[2]

[1] The notice in the chronicle of Sulpicius Severus, ii. 30, 6, may be recalled here (cf. Bernays, Ueber die Chron. des Sulp. Sev. p. 57, seq.), according to which Titus expressly resolved on the destruction of the temple in the council of war: "Quo plenius Judæorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur." Granted that the words are, as Bernays assumes, taken from the lost portions of Tacitus' history, still they must not outweigh the account of an eye-witness like Josephus, for there is no proof of Tacitus having used M. Antonius Julianus' writings (Bell. vi. 4, 3), mentioned by Minucius Felix, Octav. 33, which seem to have dealt with the Jewish war, while his constant use of Josephus' History of the War (cf. the parallels given in Lehmann, Claudius and Nero, p. 33, seq.) is well established. It might at most be thought that Tacitus, at the time of Trajan's persecution of the Christians, commits an anachronism by making Titus propose the extirpation of the Christians, but not that in the year 70 Titus considered the world must be set free from the dangers of Christianity.

[2] Bell. vi. 5, 2.

Revolting as was the crude fanaticism with which the people still clung to their Messianic hope, this superstition was far more dignified than the enlightened sycophancy of Josephus, who now declared that the words of the prophet referred to Vespasian, and the promised Messiah was the Roman emperor.[1] In truth, all prophecy seemed to have lied in the hour when the hated statues of the emperor and the eagles upon the standards were planted in the court of the temple, and when a mighty shout, resounding far and wide over the ruins of the house of God, acclaimed Titus, the destroyer, as imperator.

The Jews' confidence of victory fell when they saw the abomination of desolation set up in the holy place. The upper town was defended half-heartedly. Many deserted. Even priests humbled their pride, and for the price of their life brought sacred vessels, candlesticks and vestments, to deck the triumph of Titus. The glory of the defence of Moriah was balanced by the inglorious surrender of Zion, so far stronger from a military point of view Faith in the future of the people was gone. Simon, son of Gioras, and John of Gishala, both fell into the hands of the Romans. What was left of the city was razed; nothing was left standing but great barracks, together with the towers of Phasael, Mariamne and Hippicus, to receive the tenth legion as a permanent garrison.

Josephus could now at least atone for some of his previous sins by alleviating the lot of various prisoners. He begged the freedom of all his friends and kinsmen, besides many unknown to him. One day Titus despatched him to the mountain cleft of Tekoa, where in olden time the prophet Amos had fed his flocks, to see whether a strong camp could be established there. Riding home towards Jerusalem, he saw a clump of crosses by the wayside, with still living prisoners hanging on them. He drew near, and recognized with horror three of his friends. He hurried to Titus and begged their lives. He had them taken down and cared for by a physician; two died, the other recovered.

[1] Bell. vi. 5, 6.

At length the youthful general made ready to leave Jerusalem. He graciously thanked Josephus, and in reward for his services presented him with an estate in the plain of Sharon, which, after all the terrors of war, blooms to this day in all the wealth of flowers once praised by the Hebrew poets. The prisoners who survived the defeat had a worse fate in store for them. After finally escaping all the brutalities of the soldiery, they were despatched in companies as material for the wild-beast fights in the great theatres of the provinces, to gratify the cities' unbridled love of grand spectacles. "Ye shall lament," says Eleazar, son of the Gaulonite, to his forces, who, after the fall of Jerusalem, occupied Masada,—"you shall lament your young men, whose strength will endure so many sufferings, and mourn for the old men who cannot survive them. One shall see his wife dragged off to shame; another, with hands fast bound, shall hear the shriek of his son's agony." But the most awful sufferings only began when the wild excesses of the soldiery were over. Then the arena opened its gates, and the same sufferers had often to gratify the mob of the great cities with their agony twice and three times over. "Tortured, scourged, crucified, burnt, half torn to pieces by wild beasts, and then reserved for another meal, they ministered to the insatiable love of the heathen for shows."[1]

While the whole empire thus shared in the joy of Titus' success, the victor forgot the cries of the suffering nations in the arms of the Jewish princess. The settlement of the new régime required his presence in Syria and Cilicia. Amid the reception of deputations with crowns of honour, the giving of games, and interviews with Apollonius of Tyana and charlatans of the same stamp, the son of Cæsar wound up his business.[2] On his return through Palestine to Alexandria, he took with him Josephus, who was required in the triumph at Rome. The sight of the ruins of Jerusalem evoked some human feeling

[1] Bell. vii. 8, 7.

[2] Flav. Philostr. Apoll. vi. 29, seq.; Bell. vii. 5, 1.

even in the breasts of the Romans. From Alexandria they took ship for Rome as soon as the season permitted, Josephus in the train of the Cæsar, Simon bar Giora and John of Gishala among the prisoners. Arrived at the city, Josephus lodged in the former house of the Flavii, and acted as court historian to describe for posterity the triumph of the three Cæsars, when Simon bar Giora was dragged off to the Tarpeian rock for execution, and John of Gishala consigned to life-long imprisonment. Vespasian and Titus triumphed together; Domitian, whose conduct meanwhile had not been of the best, rode behind them on a white palfrey, the one thought of his mean soul being how he for his part could attain equal glory.[1]

The triumph of Vespasian was the first feast for many years enjoyed whole-heartedly by the city.[2] In the midst of the soldiers in full panoply marched the prisoners of Judæa. The chief events of the war were depicted on banners; a litter carried the river-god of Jordan; then came the booty, including the sacred vessels from the temple of Jehovah, the table of shewbread, the seven-branched candlestick, the rolls of the law, as they are still to be seen graved on the triumphal arch of Titus. Yet Josephus doubts whether these were the real vessels,[3] not only because, as a true Pharisee, the gold in the temple was more sacred to him than the temple itself, but also because, at the sack of the temple by the Chaldæans, God concealed them, whether by the hand of Jeremiah or by an angel. He will only admit that treacherous priests delivered over "vessels like unto them." After the sacred contents of the temple marched youths with the image of the Roman victory, and then came the triumphing princes, glorious to behold. Josephus saw his captive countrymen march by unmoved. On reaching the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, they halted until word was brought that the sentence upon Simon bar Giora was carried out. It was a grand day. The aristocracy shone in all their splendour; the people were intoxicated with delight.

[1] Suet. Domit. 2. [2] Bell. vii. 5, 6. [3] Ibid. vi. 8, 3.

Vespasian alone glanced wearily at the endless splendours of the procession and thought of the cost. Both he and Titus, moreover, refused the doubtful honour of taking the name Judaicus.[1] The sacred vessels of the temple were afterwards placed in the Temple of Peace built by Vespasian. He carried away to his palace only the curtain of the Holy of Holies and the rolls of the law.[2]

---

5. History of the Christians during the Jewish War.

The violent storms preceding the outbreak of war had already thinned the ranks of the Christians. It may also be taken for granted that Annas' persecution in 63 robbed the Church of its most important leaders, so that its faith in the advent of the Messiah stood in greater isolation than ever amid the excitement of the nations. At the same time, so terrible was the fate that fell upon the Christians in Rome, that the terror made men elsewhere think little of their own sufferings. The Church, as is shown by unmistakable tokens, saw in these days of terror the beginning of the last tribulation, which, according to Daniel, was to precede the coming of the Son of Man. Under the influence of this principle, interpolations were made in Jesus' prophecies about his return, betokening the woes of this time as the sure heralds of his advent. The time of winnowing the chaff from the wheat, spoken of by Daniel, seemed to have come. Iniquity abounded; love was growing cold. Nor was the Church spared the experience that great political events drive religious movements into the background. Just as the Essenes began to leave their isolated communities to fight for the law in the bands of Zealots,[3] so the ranks of the Nazarenes were thinned by the growing spirit of war.[4]

[1] Suet. Vesp. 12; Dio Cass. lxvi. 7. [2] Bell. vii. 5, 7. [3] Ibid. ii. 8, 10.

[4] Matt. xxiv. 12; cf. Köstlin, Urspr. u. Compos. der Synopt. Evang. p. 18, seq.

The tidings of the Messiah, too, which roused up new prophets and drew the multitude hither and thither, began to lead the Church astray. Certain it is that this subject now called forth many warnings, collected in Matt. xxiv., which was originally an independent work, a short Apocalypse, in which Jesus appears as the revealer of the last things. Written early in 68, it gives the Church directions how to maintain itself in this last and dreadful time.[1] This eschatology makes Jesus begin his speech to his disciples on the last things with the words: "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many."[2] If this warning is not superfluous at the beginning of the Apostolic period, it returns with double force where the eschatologist reveals the woes of the Jewish war: "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For

[1] The materials from which to judge how the primitive Church regarded the great tribulation of war since 66, are given above all in the sections Matt. xxiv. 1—44, and x. 17—23; Mark xiii. 1—37; Luke xxi. 5—36. In the unanimous opinion of Colani, Pfleiderer, Keim, &c., this self-contained address is a broad-sheet that appeared during the war period, urging Christians to flee from Jerusalem in the name of Jesus. The composition of this lesser Apocalypse may be placed, with Colani, Pfleiderer and Keim, early in 68; but little earlier, therefore, than the Apocalypse of John. Escape from Jerusalem is still possible, yet the destruction of the city is certain. On the other hand, the oracle already looks back upon the fate of many fugitives, as will be clear from what follows. This work, then, may have determined other brethren to take flight, and be the oracle mentioned in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii. 5, 3, which determined the bulk of the church to flee. But it was certainly not composed as early as the beginning of the war, for it clearly reflects the experiences of flight. Gadara being taken by Vespasian early in 68, and Perœa at the same time pacified, it is possible to understand how, from the spring of 68, Pella offered an asylum to which those of Jerusalem might be invited. It matters less for our object whether later experiences, retarding data, or real words of Jesus, were subsequently worked into this broad-sheet when incorporated into the Gospels, if it is once admitted that it reflects the experiences of 68. Cf. on this point, Weissenbach, der Wiederkunftsged. Jesu, p. 100, seq.; Pfleiderer, Ueber die Compos. der Eschatolog. Rede Matt. xxiv. 4, seq.; Jahrbuch für deutsche Theol. 1868, pp. 134—149; Keim, Jes. v. Naz. iii. 194, seq.; Colani, Croy. Mess. p. 208, seq.

[2] Matt. xxiv. 5.

there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."[1]

This, then, is one part of the Church's reminiscences; the tidings of the immediate return of Christ ran through the people more than once; great marvels were told by the prophets, who volunteered to reveal the beginning of the day of salvation, one beyond the Jordan, another on the Mount of Olives, another in the treasury of the temple, so that, if it were possible, they might deceive even the elect. Nevertheless, these expectations always ended in bloodshed upon the earth, instead of the sign of the Son of Man in the heavens; wherefore the writer makes Jesus say in disapproval: "Behold, I have told you before."[2] But the very fact of this complaint proves that all was not secure; and several brethren, with wife and children, followed the alluring voice of the prophet across Jordan, or into the wilderness, or to the Mount of Olives, in hope of seeing the sign of the Son of Man, but instead was trampled down by the cavalry of the procurator.

A further reminiscence of this cruel period is in the bloody persecutions which were also a sign of the last times. "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake." The same picture is painted in more sombre colours in another section: "They shall deliver you up to councils; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten; and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them. . . . But when they shall lead you and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but what-

[1] Matt. xxiv. 25. [2] Ibid.

soever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."[1] Like ruins after a fire, these words testify to terror, grief and misery, which were then visited upon the Church. Beaten in the synagogues, dragged hither and thither before the tribunals of the procurator or Agrippa by the myrmidons of Annas and Ananias, the Christians suffered bloody martyrdoms, which yet did but increase their confidence. Not a few before the judgment-seat developed an enthusiasm in which the brethren heard no weak words of a prisoner, but a loftier inspiration. But we hear not only of martyrdom and heroism, but of backsliding and recantation. Oppression made traitors as well as heroes. As the Apocalypse speaks of the faint of heart, who on the day of judgment shall have their part with the unbelievers,[2] so, too, this writer on the last things complains: "Many shall be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold."[3]

Thus the isolation of the Church increased, and approval fell off in proportion as the din of war showed the people the Messiah again in arms. The rift that went through the whole nation, even sundered peaceful country families. They began to betray and hate one another, and joined the bands of the prophets to secure Israel's happiness by the sword. For this reason the writer complains: "Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and children shall rise up against their parents, and shall cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake."[4]

All this tribulation and anarchy was a natural growth when the insurrection had burst the bonds of order, and the friends of peace were everywhere persecuted and slain. Yet the expecta-

[1] Mark xiii. 9, seq.: in Matthew attached to the speech when the Apostles are sent out, ch. xiii.; cf. verse 17, seq.

[2] Rev. xxi. 8. [3] Matt. xxiv. 10. [4] Mark xiii. 12, seq.

tion that Jesus would return at the moment of the worst tribulation, remained firm in the church of Jerusalem. Nor did they resolve to depart until the false prophets established themselves in the very temple, and one after the other—Menahem, son of the Gaulonite, Eleazar, son of Simon, Simon bar Giora and John of Gishala—entered in the guise of him whom Christianity looked for on the clouds of heaven; till one Messiah murdered the other; till the temple became a mere den of robbers, and the deadly engines taken from Cestius were set up in the sanctuary, and the shot of Eleazar and Simon flew from either side between Moriah and Zion. Moreover, they justified their resolve with a saying of the Lord. Even as, on the night of Pentecost, the Jewish priests in the temple heard the voice of heavenly beings, "Let us go hence;"[1] so now, according to Eusebius, the Church received a revelation bidding the Christians flee to Pella beyond Jordan.

If this revelation granted to the most approved men of the Church is practically identical with the eschatology of Matthew, it sprang from the conviction which then drove many Jews from Jerusalem, the same conviction which Josephus loudly proclaimed to the beleaguered city—namely, that Daniel's prophecy of the abomination of desolation being fulfilled by the Zealots' desecration of the temple, the last day had come for city and temple alike.[2] "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth, let him understand): *then* let them which be in Judæa flee unto the mountains; let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house, neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes."[3]

Hurriedly, then, as the flight took place, all did not leave Jerusalem at once. The writer of the Apocalypse knows two witnesses of Jesus who remained through the siege. They were assuredly kept there by the belief that Jesus must first appear

[1] Bell. vi. 5, 3. [2] Ibid. iv. 6, 3, v. 9, 4. [3] Matt. xxiv. 15, seq.

in Jerusalem, while others thought the coming of the Lord would be visible everywhere, like the lightning which shines from the east even unto the west.[1] Yet a further purpose was involved in this stay. The two witnesses desired to remind the people who the Messiah was throughout the time of suffering, fixed by Daniel at three-and-a-half years. "And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophecy 1260 days, clothed in sackcloth."[2] The writer of the Apocalypse compares these men to the two prophets Zerubbabel and Joshua, calling them also, in the words of the prophet, two olive-trees planted beside the candlestick of the temple.[3] "These are the two olive-trees and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth."[4] And as Elias slew his enemies by fire and shut up the heavens,[5] as Moses turned water into blood to punish the ungodly,[6] even so God will now endow his witnesses with the same power. "These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will."[7] Nevertheless, the seer knows well what fate awaits these witnesses. The beast that rises from the pit will make war against them, and will overcome and kill them. "And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified. And they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and a half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves. And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth."[8] Even so after the invasion of the Idumæans, the corpses of the high-priests Annas and Jesus might be seen lying in the streets of the city, by day gnawed by dogs, at night

[1] Matt. xxiv. 27. [2] Rev. xi. 3. [3] Zech. iv. 3.
[4] Rev. xi. 4. [5] 2 Kings i. 10—12; 1 Kings xvii. 1, seq.
[6] Exod. vii. 19. [7] Rev. xi. 4—6. [8] Rev. xi. 7, seq.

by jackals that crept in from the fields,[1] gaped upon by the rabble of every country assembled under Giora's leadership. They were hunted, says Josephus, from house to house, and slaughtered as soon as found. "Some stood upon their bodies and spurned them. To such a pitch did they carry their insults as to toss them about unburied, though the Jews are usually so careful over the burial of the dead that they even take down before sunset those who have been condemned to die upon the cross, and bury them. . . . So one might see the men, who but a little before led the worship of God, clothed in the sacred robes, now cast out naked, a prey to dogs and wild beasts."[2]

Such, too, is the fate which the seer has good reason to predict for the two witnesses of Jesus at Jerusalem. But most vivid of all are the experiences of flight as told by the narrator of the last things: "Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days," cries the prophet, filled with dire recollections. "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath-day: for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time—no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elects' sake those days shall be shortened."[3] It is not hard to catch in this description all the fresh sufferings of flight into the land beyond Jordan. Some had fled on the Sabbath, when no hand was stretched forth to support them, no arm stirred to help, and the fugitive, dragging along under the burden of his pack, was oppressed by the additional fear of being roughly handled as a Sabbath-breaker. "Pray that your flight be not in the winter," continues our writer; that is, in the rainy season, when unceasing streams pour down from the sky, and Jordan, swollen to a torrent, is nowhere fordable. According to the presupposition of the Apocalypse, these flying companies have above all to fear the reality of winter;[4] and in the fourth book of his

[1] Bell. iv. 4, 2, and 5, 2.
[2] Ibid. iv. 5, 2.
[3] Matt. xxiv. 19, seq.
[4] Rev. xii. 13, seq.; cf. with verse 3.

History of the War, Josephus draws a thrilling picture of one of these caravans fleeing before the Romans;[1] it wanders hither and thither along the banks of Jordan, seeking in vain for a shallow spot, till at last it is driven into the flood by the pursuing enemy. The Apocalypse, too, depicts the fate of the fugitive church in the same way. The dragon persecutes the woman who has brought forth the child, which is the Church. But she is given the wings of an eagle, and flies into the wilderness, to a place prepared of God, for three times and a half, far from the lurking dragon. "And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood. And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth. And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."[2] This is a highly poetic description of the sufferings which "flight in winter" brought upon the faithful. Nor did Josephus fail to recall this fury of the elements, including the thunderstorm under cover of which the Idumæans entered Jerusalem; while among the pictures which the Jewish captives were forced to carry in the triumphal procession at Rome, was one specially of "the widespread and terrible havoc caused by the flooded rivers, which do not water the fields, nor slake the thirst of cattle, but seek to quench the general conflagration with their floods."[3]

But when the Jordan was once passed, the anxious passage through heathen country began. Bands of Zealots made raids upon Philadelphia, Heshbon, Pella, Gerasa and Scythopolis.[4] They burned down Gadara, Hippos and the villages of Gaulonitis,[5] with the result that the Gentiles without exception massacred every Jew within their walls; and after the Jews came the turn of the Jews' friends.[6] Even participation in the

[1] Bell. iv. 7, 6. [2] Rev. xii. 13—17. [3] Bell. vii. 5, 5.
[4] Ibid. ii. 18, 1. [5] Ibid. [6] Bell. ii. 18, 2.

defence of the city against the bands of Zealots did not save the Jews of Scythopolis; the Jewish quarters were burnt to the ground from Batanæa to Cyprus. "Every city might be seen full of unburied corpses, old men together with infant children and women, without a shred left to cover them."[1] Under these circumstances the Church might truly count it a peculiar mercy of God that they could find a haven of refuge beyond Jordan. "The woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand, two hundred and three-score days."

According to Eusebius' History of the Church, this place Pella was on the high road to Damascus, south of Scythopolis. Here circumstances unknown to us offered the Christians a secure refuge, whether because the inhabitants of Pella imitated the example of Sidon which left the Jews unmolested, or that peace was established here, at all events, after the occupation of Peræa early in 68. Situated on a plateau, hidden behind mountains and yet on the highway, fortified and one of the league of the Decapolis, surrounded by rippling brooks and shady groves, it was in every sense a peaceful oasis.[2] Little more can be told of their sojourn in this spot than what is related by Eusebius. In consequence of a revelation, vouchsafed to several men of importance, and frequently identified with the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, the faithful retired to this city of Peræa, thence to watch the whole generation of the wicked swept off the face of the earth.[3] At their feet the Holy Land lay outstretched like a corpse, and as they watched the standards of the cohorts pass on every side, there sprang to their lips the words: "Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together."[4]

[1] Bell. ii. 18; 2, 5, 6.

[2] Plin. Hist. v. 16; Pellam aquis divitem. Bell. iii. 3, 3; i. 6, 5; 7, 7; ii. 18, 1; Ant. xiii. 15, 4, xiv. 3, 4; Robinson and Smith, Recent Discoveries, p. 421, seq., 1857.

[3] Euseb. iii. 5; Epiphan. xxix. 7.

[4] Matt. xxiv. 28.

The fixing of Jesus' advent immediately after these tribulations, shows that the long weeks of exile were filled with expectations of the Son of Man. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days," cries our narrator confidently, "shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven." This could only be written before the end of the war proved conclusively even to the most faithful that this tribulation was not the last, Matthew and Luke, indeed, introducing new limits before the advent. This, moreover, is the precise moment to which may with the highest probability be ascribed the composition of the original historical document to which this Apocalypse must have belonged.

The certainty with which the writer of this book expected the immediate return of Christ, is shown by his again making Jesus predict the fulfilment of the promises to his own generation. "This generation shall not pass till all these things be done."[1] The disciples shall not have gone through all the cities of Israel before the return of the Son of Man.[2] But it must be admitted the number of those who received this promise had dwindled to a mere handful. "There be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power;"[3] and of these, some had given up the delusive hope so long deferred, and returned to their old life of sin, like the servant who lies down to sleep because his master has taken a far journey and perhaps will not return before cock-crow.[4] But the Church had been violently startled from this sleep by the events of the latter time, so that the narrator of the last things, whose work found immediate admission into the original historic document, has to allay apprehension again and again: "The end is not yet, but when the Son of Man appears after the tribulation of those days." As certainly as

[1] Mark xiii. 30; Matt. xxiv. 34; Luke xxi. 32.

[2] Matt. x. 23. [3] Mark. ix. 1. [4] Mark xiii. 28—37.

this could only be written by one who has not known the fall of Jerusalem, but sees it in the immediate future, this historical document, underlying all our Synoptic Gospels, belongs to the last period of the war. As to the place where it was written, one may venture a conjecture. The author writes of Judæa (xix. 1) as the other side of Jordan.[1] Consequently the original historical document would seem to have received its final form in Peræa, perhaps at Pella. It is possible, too, that in the concourse of so many shades of Christians from Galilee and Judæa, the redactor met with new material which he devoted to his writing. Paradoxical as it sounds, even Pella was labouring for the future, though it was face to face with the end.

Traces of another fugitive point not to the East, but to Ephesus. There, in the year 68, a gifted Christian wrote a prophetic book, whose vivid touches set before us the figures which peopled the minds of the Christians. Looking before and after, it gives a firm picture of what the faithful felt in a higher sense, and what they expected of the future.

---

6. The Apocalypse.

We have already heard of the Jewish Christian John, who joined Paul's band of workers in proconsular Asia, and took an important pastoral position among the Christians of this province. He appeared of an uncompromising and decided character, one who spits out of his mouth everything lukewarm.[2] An ascetic, who has never defiled himself with women,[3] and who has other Essene leanings, a friend to white robes and ablutions,[4] a foe to heathendom, whose soul is pierced by the outrages of Antichrist against the temple, he was at the same time an

[1] Cf. Mark. x. 1, with Matt. xix. 1, where Matthew probably has the original form.

[2] Rev. iii. 16. [3] Rev. xiv. 4. [4] Rev. vii. 14, i. 5, xxii. 14.

opponent of Pauline freedom from the law, which he bitterly condemns in his Epistle general to the seven churches of the province.[1]

Against Paul's resolute breadth of view he sets an equally resolute Judaism. Where Paul appeals to the churches: "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed,"[2] the writer of the Apocalypse rejoins as uncompromisingly: "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life."[3] In him Paul found an adversary not inferior to himself in strength of character. With such a man the outbreak of Christian persecution in Rome could not fail to inflame Jewish hatred of the "great Babylon" into a sense of personal injury. We have already seen the inward satisfaction with which he lingers over the scenes of the great fire of Rome, how at the sight of the punishments which visited Rome, he cries: "Rejoice over her, O thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her."[4] This was the feeling with which the Jewish Christians looked back upon Nero's persecution of the Christians. Innocent as they were of burning of the great city, they found it most right and just that God should burn her once more to avenge the saints, the apostles and prophets, whom she had murdered. Considering that, in the latter years of Nero, it was expected that he would again fire the newly-built city, and make this second spectacle more wonderful than the first by letting loose the wild beasts in the circus and other melodramatic proceedings,[5] the Apocalypse for its part believes that the burning of Rome will be the first act of the returning Cæsar.[6] That

[1] Cf. supra, Vol. iii. p. 269, seq. (Eng. trans.).
[2] Gal. i. 9. [3] Rev. xxii. 18. [4] Rev. xviii. 9—20.
[5] Sueton. Nero, 43. [6] Rev. xvii. 16.

great harlot, "the city of harpers and musicians and pipers and trumpeters," the city of Nero the artist, shall be desolate, "and no craftsman, of whatsoever craft he be, shall be found any more in her."

Though other Jewish documents, such as the collected Logia of Matthew and the original historical document, go on to give the words and deeds of Jesus favourable to the Gentiles, and acknowledge the less odious attitude of the Roman procurator in the trial of Jesus, the Apocalypse sees in Rome merely the city of sin. She is "full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication," "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus, and her sins have reached unto heaven."[1]

In addition to the reasons which John had for hating Rome as a Christian, the year 66 brought others which incensed every Jew against Rome. The Roman beast had established itself, with its crowns and its name of blasphemy, upon the sand of the sea near Cæsarea.[2] In the likeness of a leopard it seized upon the holy people; with the feet of a bear it trampled the plains of Galilee; with the mouth of a lion it consumed Israel.[3] "And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle and them that dwell in heaven."[4] Jerusalem is beleaguered in the temple; it will not be long before the Holy City and the forecourts of God are trampled underfoot by the heathen.[5] Ephesus, too, could hear the clang of armour and the clatter of chariots and many horses rushing into battle; our writer sees the endless squadrons of cavalry departing for Syria to guard the Euphrates or smite the Jews.[6] Thus John followed the course of events with the same idea as the narrator of the last things in Matthew, looking to see how far they were forerunners of the coming judgment. But his point of view at Ephesus, on the border between east and west, enabled him to see at once into the heart of Rome

[1] Rev. xvii. 5—xviii. 7. [2] Rev. xiii. 1. [3] Rev. xiii. 2.
[4] Rev. xiii. 6. [5] Rev. xi. 2. [6] Rev. ix. 9, 16.

and Jerusalem. His purview is not bounded by the mountains of Pella. The whole plan of the history of the time is unrolled before him. The rock of Patmos is the prophetic watch-tower from which to view the movements of either army. Strange it is how well the man on the sea-girt mountain is posted in the affairs of the beleaguered city. As to the brethren of the church of Jerusalem, he knows under what difficulties they fled across Jordan. He knows, too, that they are safe under the protection of God. Let the storms sweep over the place God cares for, they pass without leaving a trace behind.[1] The rest he sees struggling with the sons of Satan in the city where their Lord was crucified.[2] He knows what happens in the city of the false prophets; it is full of evil-doers of every tribe and every nation; murder is rampant within her, and dead bodies lie unburied in the streets. He even knows the hopes of the besieged, reaching out beyond the Euphrates to seek succour thence;[3] and answering Agrippa's warning, "Verily the Parthian keeps a truce," with showers of stones. He knows, too, that the garrison fancies the heathen cannot force their way beyond the inner court of the temple; he gives up the outer court, but even he cannot imagine that the holy house itself will become the prey of the Gentiles.[4]

The connections of the Ephesian Jews reach not only to the mother city, but also to the capital of the world. John is no less exact when following the course of events in the Roman empire, which seemed to be falling to pieces after the death of Nero. The new Cæsar had few friends, and fewest of all in the capital itself, where the prætorians grumbled at the emperor's parsimony. The talk ran on Mucianus and Vespasian in Syria, on Verginius Rufus and Vitellius in Germany, on Nymphidius Sabinus and Otho in Rome itself. The people watched anxiously to know what the armies meant to do. Nor did this situation

[1] Rev. xii. 14.

[2] Rev. xi. 1—14.

[3] Rev. xvi. 12—16, ix. 14—21.

[4] Rev. xi. 1, 2; Bell. vi. 2, 1; 5, 2; Tac. Hist. v. 13; Dio Cass. lxvi. 5; Suet. Vesp. 4.

of affairs escape John; he announces that the horns of the beast will soon rise up against the beast himself.[1] As once the disturbance of the dodecarchy, and the sight of the threatened destruction of Egypt and Assyria, made Isaiah imagine the kingdom of God was come,[2] so John saw in the threatened downfall of the empire of the world the beginning of the last times.

But there is something else that holds the attention of mankind. It is the universal rumour that Nero was not killed that 9th of June, 68, at Phaon's villa, but only severely wounded, and afterwards was cured and escaped to the Parthians. In the rapid succession of fearful tidings, the province had never fully learnt the detailed circumstances of Nero's death; and here the report sprang up that Nero had reached his friends the Parthians, and would soon return to pass judgment on his enemies. The mob at Rome listened greedily to this tale, and their leaders spread it eagerly. There were not wanting those, says Suetonius, who long decked Nero's grave with spring and summer flowers, and now set up his statues in the prætexta beside the rostra, now produced edicts of his, as if he were still alive and soon to return. Even Vologæses, the Parthian king, took advantage of a mission to the Senate to intercede strongly for the display of proper respect to Nero's memory.[3] Tacitus notes for the beginning of the year 69 the sudden birth of the rumour that Nero was still alive, and that in the very province in which the Apocalypse was composed. "At the same time," he relates, "a baseless terror of Nero's return arose in Achaia and Asia. Various rumours about his death were afoot, whence many imagined and many believed he was still alive."[4] It was then that an adventurer, according to some a slave from Pontus, according to others a freedman from Italy, a harper and singer by profession, collected a gang of desperadoes and took ship as the returning Nero. A storm drove him to the island of Cythnus in the Ægean, where he attempted to win over

[1] Rev. xvii. 12.
[2] Is. xix.
[3] Suet. Nero, 57.
[4] Hist. ii. 8, 9.

Vespasian's envoys to the prætorians. At this moment Calpurnius Asprenas, the newly-appointed proconsul of Galatia and Pamphylia, reached the island with two ships. This party also the returning Nero approached with gestures of woe, and begged them to convey him to Syria or Egypt. Asprenas quickly made up his mind, and had him arrested and executed. His body, distinguished by the eyes, the hair and haughty features, was sent to Rome by way of Asia; but the identity of the impostor was never ascertained beyond doubt.[1] Nor was he the last. A second made his appearance under Titus,[2] and a third, mentioned by Suetonius, even under Domitian.[3] The latter almost dragged the empire into a Parthian war, for the Parthians still considered Nero as bound to them by the rights of hospitality.

John was well acquainted with the rumours of Nero's reappearance, which the Gentiles possibly connected with the proceedings in Palestine during the Jewish war.[4] He certainly feared that the false prophets in Jerusalem, who sought an alliance with the Parthians, might take Nero into the bargain.[5] If Josephus did not blush to greet Vespasian as Messiah—if, owing to Josephus, the Romans afterwards believed that the Messianic prophecy referred to the Flavii[6]—why should not the bands of Zealots take Nero's side, and, acknowledging him as the Messiah, aid him in the Holy Land to gain the honour which Caligula once desired in vain? The writer of the Apocalypse, therefore, was doubly horrified to find the terrible Cæsar, the persecutor of the Church, still among the living. At this news it dawned upon him who the Antichrist was that must precede Jesus' return. The course of nature often has an

[1] Tac. Hist. ii. 8, 9; cf. Dio Cass. xliv. 9.

[2] Zonar. xi. 18, p. 496, 12. Also an Asiatic named Terentius Maximus, Dio, lxiv. 9.

[3] Suet. l.c. Tac. Hist. 1, 3; Dio Chrysost. Or. xxi. 9.

[4] Suet. Nero, 40.

[5] Rev. xiii. 4—16.

[6] Jos. Bell. iii. 8, 9, iv. 10, 7; Suet. Vesp. 5; Tac. Hist. ii. 78, v. 13.

affinity with the course of history. These latter years were marked by many natural phenomena which gave the clearest confirmation to the belief that judgment was at hand. "Never, surely," says Tacitus, in his preface to the history of the year 68, "did evidence more conclusive prove that the gods take no thought for our happiness, but only for our punishment. Besides the manifold vicissitudes of human affairs, there were prodigies in earth and heaven, the warning voices of the thunder, and other intimations of the future."[1] The same view was taken of the comet, which caused equal alarm in Jerusalem and Rome. A former comet had been expiated by Nero's banishment of Plautus;[2] the greater one of 64 required ample streams of blood.[3] So, too, Josephus saw a star shaped like a sword gleam over the city, and the priests were terrified at the appearance, which remained a full year in the heavens.[4] In the year 60, the year in which Paul wrote his Epistle to the Colossians, their city was overthrown by an earthquake; and its sister cities of Laodicea and Hieropolis were visited by severe shocks, which were felt over the whole continent.[5] In the year 61, Greece and Macedonia were laid waste in the same manner,[6] and a new island rose out of the sea between Thera and Crete, to the astonishment of the Greeks on either shore.[7] In the year 63, Lower Italy suffered the same fate. Pompeii was reduced to ruins, and the city was rebuilt in all the splendour of imperial architecture, and given a temple of Isis to appease the All-goddess, only to be buried beneath the ashes of Vesuvius sixteen years later.[8] On these occasions the sea ebbed far out, and then, after a dreadful pause, swept back over the coast in a boiling flood.[9]

[1] Hist. i. 3. [2] Ann. xiv. 22. [3] Rev. xv. 47; Suet. Nero, 36.
[4] Bell. vi. 5, 3. [5] Tac. Ann. xiv. 27.
[6] Sen. Quæst. Nat. vi. 1, vii. 28; Ep. 91, 9.
[7] Philostr. Apoll. 4, 34.
[8] Ann. xv. 22; Eruption of Vesuvius, 79; Temple of Isis, cf. Schiller, Nero, 598.
[9] Plin. Ep. vi. 16, 20.

Besides all these calamities and harbingers of calamity, the capital suffered a still worse visitation in the plague. The consequences of the great fire were first felt in the year 65. Want of shelter among so many thousands, the lack of regular sustenance, the new dwellings of the rich and the overcrowding in the old ones, engendered an epidemic in the autumn of 65 that carried off 30,000 persons in two months, sparing neither age nor rank.[1]

Tokens such as these could not fail to remind a Christian that the coming of Christ must be preceded by the woes of the Messiah. The travailing of the world in its new birth was to be accompanied by great revolutions in heaven and upon earth. The third Evangelist sums up the expectation of his time in these words: "There shall be signs in the sun and in the moon and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after the things which are coming on the earth."[2] "And there shall be famines and pestilences and earthquakes in divers places."[3] This moment decidedly seemed to have come; it was impossible for these signs to be interpreted except as forewarnings by an epoch which expected the judgment. Till his last days Paul clung to the hope of seeing the great hour, and of putting on a new body, and meeting his Lord face to face without tasting the bitterness of death.[4] The narrator of the last things expressly repeated that it was the existing generation to whom Jesus foretold the fulfilment of the great promises.[5] How, then, could the living put any other interpretation on this riving of the joints of the world?

Now this unmistakable prediction of nature and history was confirmed by the secret lore which reveals the future at the stroke of the adept. Seven emperors, so ran the Cabbala, the sacred doctrine of numbers, must reign over the Roman empire,

[1] Ann. xvi. 13. [2] Luke xxi. 25. [3] Matt. xxiv. 7.
[4] 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51, seq.; 2 Cor. v. 1—10.
[5] Matt. xxiv. 34.

for seven is the sacred number, and for this reason Rome also stands upon seven hills.[1] The sixth is now on the throne; but none believes in his staying long; the seventh will not endure longer, for, according to Daniel xii. 7, the time of tribulation will last three-and-a-half years, so that little time is left him. Perhaps, too, John occasionally counts Daniel's "times" as decades, as is often the case in Enoch. The time of alienation from God being supposed to begin with the death of Jesus, the end is therefore at hand, for three-and-a-half decades, thirty-five years, are nearly spent.

On the other hand, the war began in 66. Two years before the seer beheld the beast come up on the sand of the sea by Cæsarea. For three-and-a-half years he is to go his ways; for three-and-a-half years the Church is to find shelter in Pella; for three-and-a-half years the heathen shall trample upon the holy city; for three-and-a-half years the witnesses of Jesus shall bear testimony; for three-and-a-half days their bodies lie in the streets:— a year and a half is all that remains for the world. If ever a computation of the sacred art seemed certain, if ever the future revealed itself to any prophet, and clear signs told him what the approaching days were bringing, it was now. History, nature and science of numbers agreed, and God, it seemed, had given John a message and its interpretation, to announce to his fellow-sufferers that the time was at hand.

It was coming quickly, moreover, for the Roman preparations never ceased, and the walls of the holy fortress began to crumble. But that the great day would come before the fall of the temple, was an absolute certainty to the Jewish Christian prophet. As the Jews, blockaded in Jerusalem, lived in the belief that the Romans would not be able to advance beyond the inner court, to cross which was forbidden to the Gentiles on pain of death, so John was certain that the outer courts alone should be trampled underfoot by the Romans, while the temple and court of the priests should remain unharmed.[2] So, too

[1] Rev. xvii. 9.

[2] Rev. xi. 1, 2.

when the flames actually licked the outer walls, John of Gishala cried to Josephus that the temple itself would never be lost.[1] So unalterable was this conviction that it even impressed itself on the Romans, and to the last day of the siege the Jews were continually joined by deserters who had more faith in the impregnability of the Holy City than in Titus' battering-rams.[2] Who, then, can wonder if John was ten-fold more certain that it would never come to this last pass, and looked instead for the signs of salvation after the three-and-a-half years' tribulation given by Daniel, a fraction of the sacred number seven. And now, because little more than a year is wanting to fulfil the time, the prophet hears a command like a trumpet blast: "What thou seest, write in a book."

If ever the signs of the times portended the approach of the judgment, if tribulation proclaimed the Messiah near at hand, if the Christ must come as soon as Antichrist raised his head, then this was the eve of judgment. The branch of the fig-tree was tender, the dawn blood-red and threatening, the world maddened and intoxicated, the congregation lukewarm, love grown cold, the Church asleep: it was high time for a prophet to rise up again and proclaim the great dawning.

But busy Ephesus, amid all the noise of the Gentiles, was no place in which to write down his history, after the fashion of other prophets, in glowing figures of speech, words of deep meaning, symbolic descriptions and mysterious numbers. South-west of Ephesus, a three-hours' sail with a favourable wind,[3] lies a lonely island called Palmosa, in those days Patmos. A few struggling olive-trees break the desolation of the flat-topped mountain that lies solitary in the sea, and silent as a tomb. Hither went John to receive the inner voice of the spirit. Far

[1] Bell. vi. 2, 1.

[2] Dio Cass. lxvi. 5.

[3] Tischendorf, Aus dem heil. lande, 1862, p. 339. The traveller of to-day is reminded of various features of life in Patmos by touches in the Apocalypse. Schubert gives a delightful account of his visit to Patmos, Reise in's Morgenland, Vol. iii. p. 424, seq.

from his native land, his thoughts nevertheless roam over to Palestine. Without any will of his own, the scene in which he lays his great drama is the soil of his own country. He stands on the white shores of Cæsarea, and sees the legions gathering there.[1] Far in the east he sees the Euphrates, where the Parthians muster their bands of horsemen.[2] He sees the mountain caverns where men flee for refuge;[3] the very locusts and scorpions of his native land mingle in his dreams.[4]

Then he stands again upon his island, as is clearly shown by his book, behind whose phrases we catch the sound of the sea. His glance ranges over the sea and the passing ships:[5] he sees in his vision the great mountain fall into the sea,[6] with a crash as if an angel cast a mighty millstone into the waves. He sees the creatures of the deep perish, the ships founder, and the water of the springs turn bitter like the sea.[7] The voice of the Messiah even sounds to him "like the sound of many waters."[8]

But while he proceeds "to show unto the servants of God things which must shortly come to pass," and to proclaim the "sending and signification" which Christ gave him by his angel, his gaze first of all remains bent upon the present; he warns the churches of Asia to fill their lamps with oil and put on a bridal garment. "For the time is at hand."[9] "He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him."[10] His first words are thus directed to the churches of hither Asia, which receive seven letters of severe criticism upon their conduct as churches and as individuals, already discussed.[11] In a further vision the prophet is carried up to heaven, where he is permitted to witness the Lamb of God opening the book of doom in which the fate of the Christian Church is written.

Six of the book's seals are quickly broken, for they contain

[1] Rev. xiii. 1. [2] Rev. ix. 13, xvi. 12. [3] Rev. vi. 15.
[4] Rev. ix. 3. [5] Rev. viii. 19. [6] Rev. viii. 8.
[7] Rev. viii. 8, seq. [8] Rev. i. 15. [9] Rev. i. 3.
[10] Rev. i. 7. [11] Supra, Vol. iii. p. 269, seq.

the past history of the Church in figures easy of interpretation. Before the opening of the seventh seal comes a short respite, preceding the last judgment or seal. Reviewing the past, the prophet sees it clearly divided into four periods. The first triumph of success at Pentecost 35, with the Messiah's glorious entry into the world: the white horse. The ensuing terror of war and rumours of war from the Arabs and Parthians, with fiery appearances in heaven and blood upon the earth: the red horse. The famine under Claudius: the black horse. Finally, the time of sorrow and death, following the famine: the pale horse, on which rode Death, attended by the shades of the lower world.

These times of war, hunger and pestilence, were now followed by a different kind of calamity, applying only to the Christian Church. The seer therefore drops the figure of the heavenly horsemen, and a new scene is disclosed. The fifth seal brings us to the time of Nero, the fifth Cæsar. We see beneath the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held; we hear their lament, "How long!" and their cry for vengeance. And the cry seems to find an echo in the burning of the heavens and the heaving and shaking of the earth.

The sixth seal tells in prophetic figures of the earthquakes which, from the year 60 on, shook Palestine, destroyed Laodicea and Colossæ, overthrew Pompeii and Herculaneum, and were not entirely quieted till the eruption of Vesuvius ten years later.[1] These are the phenomena of the last times, when the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, when the meteors of heaven fell, as a fig-tree casts her untimely figs. These are the same occurrences which Tacitus has in mind under the year 65, "the fury of the sea, frequent thunderbolts, and a comet which Nero made expiation for each time with noble blood."[2] John employs the fervid eloquence

[1] Ann. xiv. 27, xv. 22, 47; Hist. i. 3, 18; Liv. xxxix. 46.

[2] Ann. xv. 47.

of the prophet: "And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men and the captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains."[1]

With this at last the seer stands face to face with the outbreak of the Jewish war, in his eyes the beginning of the end. The succession of the woes of the last judgment is also clearly given in other narratives of the last things. The sequence is the same in Matt. xxiv.: "And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass; but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines and pestilences and earthquakes in divers places."[2] Our writer, then, has only given a more figurative account of a vision common to all the Christian Church.

With the seventh chapter the writer reaches the seventh seal and his actual surroundings.[3] We are eager to learn what this seal will bring, for it contains futurity to the writer; but now he introduces a pause. For him it is a time of preparation and making ready, while the angels go through the world to seal the servants of God upon the forehead, that they may be exempted from the coming horrors. It is the situation of the year 68. The Romans have completed the circumvallation of Jerusalem; Vespasian is ready to tighten his grip. The Roman beast has come up on the sands of the sea near Cæsarea to deal the last blow to the Holy City.[4] Within the city civil war rages, and the bodies lie unburied in the public streets.[5] The Chris-

[1] Rev. vii. 14. [2] Matt. xxiv. 6, seq.

[3] For the fixing of this moment in the year 68, and more nearly between June 68 and January 69, cf. the commentary on Rev. xiii. 18 and xvii. 9; also my article "Apocalypse" in Schenkel's Bibel-lexicon and in Bunsen's Bibelwerk.

[4] Rev. xii. 18, xiii. 1. [5] Rev. xi. 9.

tian Church has quitted Judæa; has crossed Jordan amid countless perils, and seeks refuge in the wilderness.[1] The Holy City seems lost, when sudden news from the capital brings the siege to a standstill. Nero is dead, and Vespasian cannot prosecute the war without authority from Galba.

Then came a pause, brooding sultry over the world like an impending thunder-storm. Vespasian had called up the troops from the Euphrates, leaving the frontier bare, in reliance upon Nero's treaty with Parthia.[2] Nero was dead; would not the horseman kings make an incursion into Syria with their flying bands? What if Nero was not dead, but had reached the Parthians, and was about to return at their head? What was to be expected of the proconsuls of the ten provinces, every one of whom hankered after the diadem? What of the armies of Syria, Italy and Upper Germany? Would they support Galba, or join Nero if he returned? In his fiery hate of Rome, John invariably gives the most unfavourable answer to these questions. He gives a fine description of the oppressive sense of this momentous pause. Four angels stand at the four corners of the earth and hold the winds of the earth, "that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree." Meanwhile, the messengers of God go silently through the world, sealing the servants of God upon the forehead, that they may be scathless when the storm breaks. A hundred and forty-four thousand is the number of the Jewish Christian Church whom John considers worthy to enter the kingdom. Nevertheless, behind them stands a great multitude of all nations who had passed through the tribulation of the last times, and washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. They, too, shall be ruled by the Lamb; he shall lead them to living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.[3]

When this is completed, and a small portion of Israel, together with a still smaller portion of the Gentile world, is marked out

[1] Rev. xii. 15. [2] Tac. Ann. xv. 28, 29. [3] Rev. vii. 4—17.

for salvation from the tribulation to come, the seventh seal is broken. Then "there was silence in heaven about the space of half-an-hour." Even after this last and breathless pause the judgment does not immediately begin; the seven angels that stand before God are given seven trumpets, and again the great drama is divided into seven acts. On the other side of the altar of God comes another angel, carrying the prayers of the saints in a golden censer, "and the smoke of the incense which came with the prayers of the saints ascended up before God." But he is bidden take the censer, and fill it with fire of the altar of God, and pour it forth on the earth; then there were voices and thunderings and lightnings and an earthquake, and the woes of the last time began. Trumpet after trumpet sounds; fearful droughts parch the earth; the sea becomes blood; a star falls on the earth and poisons her fountains; sun and moon shine feebly, and the third part of the stars is darkened.

When the first four trumpets have sounded, and ancient chaos threatens to establish itself throughout the universe, and twilight broods over the earth, the seer hears a sound overhead, and sees a mighty eagle flying through the midst of heaven and crying with a loud voice: "Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabiters of the earth, by reason of the voices of the trumpet of the three angels which are yet to sound!"

Again an angel advances with the fifth trumpet; then locusts sweep down upon the earth, yet not earthly locusts such as the wide plains engender, but horrible prototypes of them that were confined in the secret chambers of the world, where dwell Abaddon, Apollyon, the god of destruction, and all noxious things. And they eat no grass nor any green thing, but torment with scorpions' stings all men who have not the seal of God on their foreheads. The torment lasts five months; men shall seek death and not find it, and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them. At length this woe is over, and two more woes come. At the sixth trumpet a voice sounded from the horns of the heavenly altar, saying: "Loose the four angels which are

bound in the great river Euphrates. And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for a day and a month and a year, for to slay the third part of men. And the number of the army of the horsemen were two hundred thousand." These were the Parthians, who now invaded the empire, yet not the earthly horsemen of the Arsacids, who rode in gleaming coats of mail beneath silken banners, and shook the plain with the clatter of kettle-drums; it is their image in heaven that John sees—strange, misshapen figures, bright in demoniac colours: "I saw the horses in the vision, and them that sat on them, having breastplates of fire and of jacinth and brimstone; and the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions, and out of their mouths issued fire and smoke and brimstone."[1]

Six trumpets have sounded, and now the end of all comes with the seventh. There would still be time for repentance, but all these terrible judgments have failed to bring the Gentile world to repent. "The rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold and silver and brass and stone and of wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk; neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts."[2] It is high time, then, for the last judgment to begin.

But before the last woe is disclosed, another moment of rest intervenes. Besides the punishments which he may describe, others are revealed to the seer which he may not pronounce. The angel who bids him be silent, swears to him by the Eternal that there should be no more delay. But before the judgment begins, the temple of God in Jerusalem must be made safe from the abominations of the last days. John is given a reed like a measuring-rod and wafted to Jerusalem, before which lies Vespasian with his legions. "Rise," says the voice, "and measure the temple of God and the altar and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple, leave out,

[1] Rev. ix. 15, seq. [2] Rev. ix. 20, seq.

and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the Holy City shall they tread underfoot forty and two months."[1]

Immediately the seer beholds the fate of Jerusalem and of the Church mirrored in heaven. Before the last judgment begins, the Holy City shall do infinite penance. The two murdered witnesses of Jesus shall ascend to heaven in a cloud before the sight of Jerusalem, and at the self-same hour an earthquake shall destroy the tenth part of the city and carry off seven thousand of its inhabitants. Then at last the others take warning, repent and believe in the gospel. From that moment Jerusalem is once more the chosen of Jehovah, the beloved city. Once more the Lord has a house among men, and the fulfilment follows. The seventh trumpet shall sound, and the cry of innumerable voices rises in heaven: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." The elders of the celestial assembly come before the heavenly throne and say: "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth." When they had thus spoken, the temple of God was opened in heaven, and within it was seen the ark of the testament, which was carried off into the eternal glory when the Chaldees burned the earthly temple.

But the sign of the Old Testament is immediately met with a corresponding vision which represents the New. Again the thoughts of the seer first plunge into the past. He beholds the true Israel of the faithful as a woman wearing a crown of twelve stars, and about to give birth to the Messiah. She bears him in her womb and cries, travailing in birth and pained to

[1] Rev. xi. 1.

be delivered. Against her comes the dragon, Satan, who even in heaven bears the insignia of the imperial Cæsars. "And the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born." Is it Herod that sought the child, or Pilate that crucified the Messiah, whose image flits before the seer? However it be, the assaults of Satan are foiled. As the Son of Man was carried up to the right hand of God, so the son of the woman is carried up to God and to his throne. The dragon is cast out from heaven by Michael and his angels, and makes war upon the Church on earth, and first of all in Palestine, persecuting and scattering it.

Then like Behemoth he comes forth upon the sand of the sea, to bring upon the scene two new powers hostile to God, the legions of Rome and the false prophets. As Daniel makes the four great beasts, which signify the successive empires of the world,[1] arise out of the sea, so John sees the Roman beast come against the Holy Land from the sea. The beast has ten horns, according to the number of provinces in the empire, and his seven heads are explained by the writer himself[2] as signifying the seven emperors who were to reign in Rome. The sixth of them now reigns; but how long is he to endure? He, too, who succeeds Galba "must continue but a short space." For now arises the mystery of iniquity which Satan has conceived. As soon as Rome has reached her seventh Cæsar, the law of the sacred number and the symbolism of the city upon seven hills require her to fall. She shall fall, moreover, by the Cæsar who lived as one of the five preceding heads to return as the eighth. God has his Christ; Satan, his Antichrist; and this Antichrist is to be found in the line of Cæsars. He is the beast "that was and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit and go into perdition; and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was,

[1] Dan. vii. 3. [2] Rev. xvii. 10.

and is not, and yet is."[1] This same beast, the former Cæsar who is to return as the eighth, is also described as the wounded head of the beast. "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded unto death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast."[2] Once more we are assured that his deadly wound was healed;[3] it had the wound by the sword, yet afterwards came back to life.[4]

These allusions compel us to think of the one Cæsar of whom legend told that he would return. The author himself had banished every doubt, for in xiii. 18, he gives us the name of him that was and shall be again. "Here is wisdom," he says. "Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man, and his number is six hundred, three-score and six." It has already been shown that this number is the sum of the numbers represented by the Hebrew letters corresponding to Neron Kesar.[5]

This brings us to the very heart of the ideas prevailing in Asia Minor during the reign of Galba, the sixth head, when, according to xvii. 10, the Apocalypse was written. In the returning Nero, John sees Daniel's man of sin, the king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, who is to precede the coming of the Son of Man. The Rabbis once saw Antichrist in Caligula; since the persecution of the year 64, Nero had been the Nazarenes' Antichrist. And now the last enemy was to appear on the throne of the Cæsars.[6] Who could the man of sin be but the bloodthirsty persecutor of the Church, the incarnation of every sin, murderer of his brother, his mother and his wife, incendiary and king of the rabble, the son of the pit, whom even hell had not power to hold?

The returning emperor, then, is set before us as a separate beast, though at the same time one of the heads of the former beast, the Roman empire; just as this beast again passes into

[1] Rev. xvii. 8.
[2] Rev. xiii. 3.
[3] Rev. xiii. 12.
[4] Rev. xiii. 14.
[5] Time of Jesus, Vol. i. p. 116 (Eng. trans.)
[6] 2 Thess. ii. 3, seq.

the great dragon Satan, who really is the ultimate power at the back of these puppets, one and all. The devil gives the returning Nero "his power and his seat and great authority; and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months."

The return of Nero is associated in the Holy Land with another power. The false Christ joins Antichrist. If the leaders of the Jewish insurrection did not blush to call in the Parthians to help establish the holy kingdom, they will not shrink from alliance with the friend of the Parthians. Liars they were assuredly from the beginning, for they clothe themselves in the robe of Christ and play the part which befits the Lamb alone. Christ once described the false prophets as wolves in sheep's clothing: this beast, too, has the aspect of a lamb and speaks like a dragon.[1] Now Josephus often mentions the miracles ascribed to Eleazar, Simon's son,[2] and the narrative of the last things in Matthew attests the sensation caused by these identical occurrences among the Christians.[3] Hence the magic spectres with which John imagines this alliance of Nero and the false prophets surrounded. Besides, tradition declared that the appearance of Antichrist should be accompanied by great signs and wonders. Above all, ever since Caligula's attack on the temple of Jerusalem, it had been a constant feature in the accounts of the last things that the Antichrist would require divine honours to be paid to his image,[4] fulfilling in the popular eye Daniel's prediction of the abomination of desolation in the holy city, should Israel participate in Cæsar-worship, which their fathers had resisted victoriously under the lead of Philo

[1] Rev. xiii. 11. [2] Bell. ii. 20, 3. [3] Matt. xxiv. 11.

[4] 2 Thess. ii.; cf. supra, Vol. iii. Part iv. 1, Eng. trans., p. 215. Targ. Jon. on Is. xi. 4.

and Agrippa. Daniel found a sign of the approaching judgment in the great falling away of the Hellenists, who bowed the knee before the altar of the Syrians. The Christian's prediction was of the same kind: "Christ cometh not except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . He whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."[1] Agreeably to this prediction, John promises that this false prophet, whether it be John of Gishala he has in mind, or Simon bar Giora, or Eleazar, son of Simon, shall lead the inhabitants of the earth astray to make an image of the beast which had the wound of the sword and is healed. And it is given him after the power of Satan to give speech to the image of the beast; and all that will not worship the image of the beast are slain. Men even mark themselves with the number of the new god as his servants, and every coin bears his image and a name, "so that no man might buy or sell save he that had the mark or the name of the beast or the number of his name."[2]

This completes the requirement of prophecy. As soon as Nero as Antichrist brings about the great falling away, the Christ will appear. Therefore after the abomination of desolation is set up in the holy place, the seer beholds the sign of the Messiah on the hill of Zion over against him. "And lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Zion, and with him 144,000 having his Father's name writen in their foreheads." And the seer hears the heavenly host singing, and sees the angels flying over the earth to proclaim an everlasting gospel, and to warn the faithful against the worship of the beast. "And behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of Man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle."

[1] 2 Thess. ii. 4, 8, 10. [2] Rev. xiii. 15.

And he thrust in his sickle on the earth, for the corn is white, and the grapes of the vine are fully ripe. And the wine-press is trodden before the walls of Jerusalem, and the blood reaches to the horses' bridles, and the stream of blood rushes down the whole length of Palestine, the space of 1600 stades (183 miles).

With this at last begins the fulfilment of the woes of the seventh trumpet. They are poured out in seven vials of wrath, each containing a new plague. All water is turned into blood, for so it was willed by this generation, which thirsted after blood. The angel of the waters even says to God, "Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art and wast and shalt be, because thou hast judged this. For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy."[1] The sixth angel pours out his vial "upon the great river Euphrates, and the water thereof was dried up that the way of the kings of the East might be prepared."

Satan and the false prophet send out their spirits to all the ends of the earth, and call the ten princes of the world, the proconsuls, to the aid of Nero. They gather together at Harmagedon, i.e. Rômah hagedôlah, great Rome, to chastise the harlot. "These have one mind, and shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and shall burn her with fire." Parthians and Jews, barbarians and Greeks, are encamped before the city: Vologæses and Nero, Simon bar Giora, Vespasian, Verginius Rufus and Vitellius. All the mighty ones have united to put an end to the sinful city in which the blood of all nations has been poured out. This Satan's host may do, for such is the will of God. "For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give the kingdom unto the beast until the words of God shall be fulfilled."

And now an angel has gathered all the fowls of the air to feed on the bodies of the slain, and another voice bids the

[1] Rev. xvi. 5.

Christian go forth: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double." Then the sound and stir are silenced in the streets of the busy metropolis; the sound of the mill is heard no more; no lamp sheds light any more upon her ruins; only a column of smoke rising over the city tells afar the fate of Babylon and her punishment. On the shore stand the merchants who traded with the great city, and cry as they see the smoke go up, while the host of the saints praise the Lord that he has avenged the blood of his servants on Rome.

When Antichrist and the false prophet, the kings of the East and the ten princes, have fulfilled the will of God and chastised Rome, Nero's army has fulfilled its purpose, and he comes of whom prophecy said he would blow away the wicked Armillus with the spirit of his mouth.[1] "And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called True and Faithful, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God." He was followed by the armies of heaven upon white horses, and clothed in white linen. While the Messiah thus leads forth his host, Nero, too, musters his forces with the intention of warring against Christ. The battle itself is not described, but an angel at once calls with a loud voice to all the birds that fly in the midst of heaven: "Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God, that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great." Nero is taken, together with the false prophet, and cast into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. The rest are slain by the sword; the birds flock

[1] 2 Thess. ii. 8; cf. also supra, Vol. iii. (Eng. trans.), p. 215.

about their bodies. Then an angel descends from heaven, with the key of the bottomless pit in one hand, and a strong chain in the other. "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him till the thousand years should be fulfilled." The great day of God, the day of Jehovah, whereof all prophets prophesied, has dawned. Since a thousand years are as a day in the sight of God,[1] the day of victory will last a thousand years. Thrones shall be set up, as Daniel foretold, and they sit upon them; the apostles have judgment given to them. The righteous waken, and reign with Christ a thousand years. "This is the first resurrection." "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle.[2] And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about and the beloved city; and fire came down out of heaven and devoured them." And now Satan himself is flung into the burning lake to join Nero and the false prophet; and they are tormented day and night for ever and ever.

The powers opposed to God being thus rendered innocuous, the judgment of the world follows, at which he appears from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away. The sea gives up its dead, and the nether world gives up its dead. The books are opened, and whoever is not written in the book of life is cast down into the lake of fire. "And there was a new heaven and new earth." The new Jerusalem descends from heaven, with its gates of pearl and foundations of precious stones. Here the faithful are to live before the face of God for ever and ever. With this brilliant prospect John closes the revelation of what is to happen in the immediate future.

Taking these finely-drawn scenes of the Apocalypse, and inferring from them the attitude of the Jewish Christian Church

[1] Ps. xc. 4.

[2] After Ezek. xxviii. 39.

towards the great questions of the time, it is clear, in the first place, that this attitude is hostile to both the contending parties. The Jewish false prophet, who raised the standard of rebellion, is plunged into the eternal pit no less than Nero, the Antichrist. But John assumes a different attitude towards the nations involved. In his eyes Israel has been deceived by false prophets; Rome is the people of iniquity from the beginning. Nine-tenths of Jerusalem shall be converted; of Rome, not a soul shall be saved. Thus John clings to the future of his people as he does to its past. Israel forms the people of the kingdom, each tribe contributing 12,000 citizens, that the promises of the fathers may be fulfilled. He knows the ark of the covenant and the vessel of manna of the fathers are laid up in heaven; on earth, the temple, he feels, stands under God's protection.

If it be asked whether the Church, and, above all, John himself, believed every detail of his revelation, the answer would necessarily be: He believed in them as the seer believes in his visions, the poet in his imaginings. The main outlines were certain and irrefragable; the details were given him by tradition and study of the prophets. John's contemporaries believed they saw with the bodily eye the things which he saw with the spiritual eye and projected into poetical shape—nocturnal lights, shining altars, gates rolled back, and heavenly armies.[1] But all his images really tend to proclaim one message: Rome will fall, and Jerusalem be restored by the Son of Man, who will return immediately in the glory of heaven. "Every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him."

We have seen already how far his expectation was from fulfilment. Sinful Babylon renewed her empire upon her seven hills, and gained a new period of glory through the destroyers of Jerusalem. Jerusalem sank into ruins, together with her sanctuary. Vain it was for John to draw a charmed line round the temple with his rod. The Roman soldier flung his firebrand

[1] Bell. vi. 5, 3; Tac. Hist. v. 13.

across the sacred circle into the Holy of Holies, disillusioning the John of the Apocalypse no less than the hundreds of Jews who, Josephus tells us, gazed at the heavens while the porticoes of the temple were in flames, watching for the tardy Messiah in whom their leaders had made them trust. The smoke rose up from the ashes of Jerusalem, but no sign of the Son of Man appeared in heaven.

But the faith of their hearts was not crushed by the signs of the times. The ensuing years make it equally evident that Christianity continued to look for the advent. Indeed, immediately after the shock of deepest disillusion caused by the fall of the temple, within two years of the writing of the Apocalypse, the strong faith of an Egyptian Christian found it possible to repeat the gist of the prophecy. When the victorious Vespasian came to Alexandria, a Christian wrote the oracle which is to be read in the collection of the Sibyl, v. 361–433. A second time the Sibyl beholds the temple fall headlong, and fire, fanned by heavenly agencies, consume the once splendid house built by the saints and believed to be eternal. The Cæsar, "unsightly and unclean," leaves the temple lying in ruins, and therefore shall be punished by losing his throne as soon as his foot touches the imperishable continent. For then the matricide, the incendiary, shall rise up on the bounds of the earth. He overthrows tyrants, and rallies the recreant Christians to his side. The plains of Macedon, that have so often decided the fate of mankind, shall once more see the final battle, which shall be followed by the fall of Rome, the reign of Antichrist, and then the appearance of Jesus.

But once more disillusion dogged the footsteps of prophecy. Vespasian, the Cæsar, "unsightly and unclean," entered the metropolis in triumph with his sons, and no god avenged the sanctuary of Jerusalem. Yet a few years later, when the eruption of Vesuvius struck panic into Italy, the voice of another Sibyl was heard, uttering the same prophecy,[1] and was followed

[1] Sib. iv. 130, seq.

by similar voices throughout the ensuing century.[1] We may conjecture a distorted reminiscence of this Christian-Jewish legend in Suetonius' statement that the Chaldæans prophesied of Nero that he would indeed lose the Roman empire, but would afterwards become king of Jerusalem instead. These Chaldæans were in all probability none other than John.[2]

Following the victorious career of the Johannine poesy, there must have grown up within the youthful Church itself a doctrine of the last things in practical agreement with the conception there developed, which, indeed, is thoroughly sound at the core. For above the error of temporary expectation rises majestically the eternal truth of the moral conceptions expressed by the prophet. Iniquity returns in ever-changing forms. The power of the world, though mightier even than Rome, can at most touch the outer courts of religion, and never its true core. Faith in God, though beaten down and flung naked into the streets for dogs and beasts to tear, still looks forward to a resurrection. These are thoughts which Christianity had need of in the coming struggles. It therefore refused in later and quieter days to be deprived of a book which was its staff and stay in the days of affliction.

[1] Locc. citt. in Renan, Antichr. 367.

[2] Suet. Nero, 40.

INDEX.

Abilene, ii. 79.

Abomination of desolation, ii. 60 sq., 66 (Matt.); iv. 232, 250, 275.

Abraham, universal fatherhood of, in Philo as in Paul, i. 200; iii. 22.

Abulfatah, ii. 107.

Academy, i. 29. New A., i. 33, 39.

Achaia, iii. 228-52.

Achaicus, iii. 240.

Acte, iv. 81.

Acts, ii. 107; describes Pentecost from Rabbinical sources, 118, 134, 145-6, 156, 174, 206, 227; tendency of, iii. 31 sq., 71, 141-3, 179-80. Paul at Philippi, 207, 211; at Athens, 231-3, 260-6; iv. 110-1, 113, 116.

Acts of Peter, ii. 145.

Adam, the heavenly or second, iii. 60, 95-104, 106-7, 112.

Adiabene, i. 125; ii. 95, 189.

Adonis, i. 4.

Advent, iii. 116 sq.; how regarded by Paul, iv. 33-4, 263.

Ægæ, iii. 6.

Afranius Burrus, *v.* Burrus.

Agabus, iv. 109.

Agape, ii. 137, 140-1; *v.* Love-feast.

Agrippa I., ii. 15-16; youth, 17; at Malatha, 20; Tiberias, 21; return to Rome, 22-3; tutor to Tiberius Gemellus, 23; disgrace at Tusculum, 24; in favour with Caligula, 25-6; at Alexandria, 27; enters on kingdom, 27; ruins Antipas, 30. At Rome again, 53; appeals for temple, 55 (and iv. 276); eludes Caligula's murderers, 75; kingdom enlarged by Claudius, 78-80, cf. 179; follows Pharisees, 81-3; real life, 84; theatre, 85; protects Jews, 85; persecutes Christians, 86; fortification of Jerusalem, a menace to Rome, 86-8; death, 88 and 90. His government, 90-1, 166-79; causes famine of third seal, 91; family life, 92-9. Christian view of his death, 168; rebellions after, 181.—iv. 92, 191, 276.

Agrippa II., ii. 84, 86, 92, 183, 186; iii. 34; iv. 89, 95-9, 126, 129, 191; breach of the law, 192; 194-6, 226-7, 235.

Agrippina, ii. 18-9, 77-8; iv. 73-4, 81; death, 82.

Ahi, i. 4.

Ahriman, i. 4.

Alabarch, i. 140.

Albinus, ii. 173; iv. 131, 134, 187, 189.

Alexander, alabarch, i. 161; ii. 22, 42, 50, 79.

Alexander of Ægæ, iv. 75.

Alexander, the copper-smith, iii. 259, 264, 266; iv. 163-4.

Alexander, son of Simon of Cyrene, ii. 132, 211.

Alexander Tiberius, *v.* Tiberius.

Alexandria, Jews in, i. 136-44; ii. 39-50. Privileges, i. 139; numbers and language, 140; Greek and Hebrew Bible, 141-3; writers, 144; religious strife in, 201. Synagogue as temple of Caius, ii. 46; aim of Judaism, 99; relieved by Claudius, 79 sq.

Alexandrian philosophy and Old Test., i. 52. Relig. Phil., 145-61. (Plato, 146; Aristobulus, 147; Dualism and intermediaries, 146-7; Logos, 148-56; Wisdom and prophecy, 155-6; allegorizing, 157-61.)
Allegorical treatment of Scripture, i. 157-61, 189-97; iii. 3, 26 sq.
Amaram, ii. 181.
Amphipolis, iii. 209.
Ananias, ii. 134.
Ananias, converts Izates, i. 125, 129; iii. 185.
Ananias, disciple, ii. 208; iii. 59.
Ananias Nebedai, iv. 94-5, 100, 103-5, 112, 115, 128.
Anchiale, iii. 5.
Anchialus, iv. 156, and note.
Andrew, ii. 131.
Angels, i. 146; iii. 102.
Anicetus, iv. 75, 82, 86, 88.
Anilæus, ii. 94-5.
Annas, ii. 10, 21; iv. 95.
Annas the Younger, iv. 130-1, 135, 191, 196-7; in Jewish War, 200-4, 229-30.
Annas, sons of, ii. 10, 14, 146; iv. 103; *v.* Caiaphas, Jonathan, Matthias, Theophilus.
Ansgar, ii. 115; iii. 49.
Anthony, St., ii. 115.
Antichrist, iv. 274; ii. 60 sq.
Antioch, ii. 96, 160, 172, 177, 189; Christianity in, 208; Paul in, iii. 140 sq.; relation to other churches, 141, 161, 164-5; circumcision, 175-6, 205.
Antioch of Galatia, iii. 152, 187.
Antiochus Epiphanes (in Apion), i. 212; ii. 60, 90, 209.
Antiochus of Commagene, ii. 26, 87; iv. 89, 218.
Antipas, ii. 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 27-30. His invasion, how viewed by John and Christians, 102; fears Jesus to be the risen Baptist, ii. 21, 113, iii. 74.
Antipater (Stoic), iii. 6.
Antisthenes, i. 36.
Antonia, i. 161, 163; ii. 22-3.
Apelles, ii. 26.
Apion, i. 206-15; attacks Jews, 211 sq.; ii. 42, 47, 49, 59.
Apocalypse (the red horse), ii. 12, 27, 119; (white horse), 119; legalist views, 176; third seal (famine), 186-8; fourth seal (pale horse), 189; Song of the Lamb, 220; Gentile salvation, 227, 230; approaching end, 234. Author of, iii. 267; Judaist and anti-Pauline, 267-76; iv. 257; iv. 106, 134, 171. General account of, 256-82; sign of Old and New Test., 272; the Beast, Antichrist, 273-4, and false Christ, 275; hostility to both sides in the war, 280; general belief in, 280; prophecy renewed in the Sibyl, 281.
Apocalypse of Elias, iii. 21, note.
Apocalypse of Matthew, iv. 247-56.
Apocalypse of Moses, iii. 21.
Apocalyptic feeling, creates Gentile churches, ii. 196-8, 201; in Greece, iv. 3.
Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii, iv. 77.
Apollo, in Plato, i. 29; in Platonists, i. 60; patron of Tarsus, iii. 5.
Apollonia, iii. 209.
Apollonius, of Cilicia, iii. 8.
Apollonius, Egyptian, ii. 26.
Apollonius Molon, i. 204.
Apollonius of Tyana, life, i. 54, 84; iii. 6, 229, 264; iv. 237.
Apollos, ii. 102, 113; iii. 246, 254, 259, 261; iv. 4, 12-7, 22, 30.
Apphia, 119, 124.
Aquila (and Priscilla), ii. 213-4; iii. 235, 240-1, 245-7, 251, 254, 258-9, 266; iv. 4, 56.
Archedemus, iii. 6.
Archippus, iv. 119.
Aretas, ii. 11, 13, 14, 95, 163-4; iii. 72, 74.
Aristarchus, iii. 211-226; iv. 108, 115, 117, 139-40, 143, 176.
Aristarchus of Samos, i. 69.
Aristeas, Ep. of, i. 114, 144, 155, 157; iii. 29.
Aristides, i. 79.
Aristippus, i. 36.
Aristobulus of Alexandria, i. 111, 116, 143, and esp. 147.
Aristobulus (Herod), ii. 17.
Aristobulus the younger, ii. 17, 21, 53.

Aristobulus, son of Herod of Chalcis, ii. 30; iv. 90, 97, 99.
Aristophanes and religion, i. 17, 81.
Aristotle, i. 49, 50. In Alexandrian philosophy, 145, 149.
Armalgus, ii. 63.
Armillatus, ii. 33, 63.
Armillus, ii. 33 note, 63; iv. 278.
Artabanus, ii. 9, 15, 29, 94.
Artapanus, i. 115-6.
Artemis, in Plato, i. 29.
Ascanius Labeo, iv. 74.
Asceticism, i. 52-3.
Ashdod, church of, ii. 204.
Ashera, i. 5.
Asia, and Paul, iii. 252-76; churches of, 265.
Asinæus, ii. 94.
Ass, said to be worshipped by Jews, i. 212-3.
Assassins, iv. 100-1, 128.
Assos, iii. 269; iv. 108.
Athenodorus, iii. 6.
Attalia, iii. 144, 161.
Attis, i. 92; ii. 122.
Augustus and Eleusinian mysteries, i. 80; and Cæsar-worship, ii. 82.
Aziz of Emesa, ii. 92; iv. 96.

Baal, i. 4, 8.
Babilus, iv. 83.
Babylon, ii. 95.
Balaam, the teaching of, ii. 176; iii. 271; iv. 28, 37.
Balbillus, iii. 258.
Banus, ii. 101.
Baptism, ii. 141; iii. 109, 111-2; by Paul, iii. 240, 244.
Baptist communities, ii. 101, 104-5, 120. School of John Baptist, iii. 258; iv. 12-14.
Barnabas, ii. 133-5, 189, 208 note, 211; iii. 125, 142-3, 170, 176-7, 180-1; iv. 122.
Barsabas, iii. 176.
Baruch, i. 143, 202; ii. 94.
Batanæa and Bathyra, ii. 90.
Baucis, iii. 159.
Beauty and Bands, ii. 174-5.
Bel and the Dragon, i. 115, 143, 202.
"Benefactors," ii. 21.
Bernard, St., ii. 115; his preaching, 221.
Bernice (elder), ii. 18.
Bernice (younger), i. 162; ii. 84, 90, 92; iii. 229; iv. 97-9, 126, 194-5; m. Titus, 226, 235.
Berœa, ii. 48-9.
Berytus, ii. 85.
Bethany, ii. 116.
Bion, iii. 6.
Bithynia, iii. 188.
Boethes, iii. 6.
Boëthusi, ii. 82.
Britannicus, ii. 78; iv. 74, 81.
Brotherhood, universal, i. 62.
Burrus, Afranius, iv. 75-6, 81, 85, 90, 99, 125, 193.

Cæsar-worship, ii. 31-9; opp. by Jews, 38, 46; in Bk. Wisdom, 68, 76.
Cæsarea, ii. 88-90; church of, 205; iv. 116, 124-5, 193.
Cæsonia, ii. 37, 57-8.
Caiaphas, ii. 10, 11, 146.
Caligula, repeals anti-Jewish laws, i. 136, and ii. 51; life, ii. 3-66; attack on temple, 50 sq.; how viewed by Hebraists and Hellenists, 67; in 3 Macc. as Philopator, 73; as Antichrist, iv. 74.
Candace, ii. 151, 204.
Cannibalism, alleged of the Jews, i, 212.
Cantheras, ii. 82, 182.
Capernaum, ii. 109, 116.
Carpus, iii. 269.
Carrabas, ii. 43.
Cassius Longinus, ii. 179.
Catherine of Siena, iii. 49.
Celsus, ii. 202-3.
Census in Palestine (of Cestius), iv. 188.
Cestius Gallus, iv. 188, 195, 197-200.
Chærea, ii. 58, 76.
Chæremon, iv. 75; the elder, i. 204.
Chalcis, ii. 79, 95; iv. 89.
Chaldæans, ii. 93-4.
Chloe, iii. 240, 244; iv. 30.
Christ and legalism, ii. 228; party of, iv. 19, 21 note, 22, 52-4.
Christians, distinguished from other Jewish schools, ii. 126; name, ii. 211; Christianity, how spread, ii. 195; with-

out apostles, 201; in great cities, 203-16; influence, 223; Jewish, 226-40; in Nero's palace, iv. 167; during Jewish War, iv. 246-56.
Christophany, iii. 111, 160, 167, 176.
Church, Palestinian; sufferings, ii. 127; migration to Jerusalem, 128-43; usages, 140; miracles, 141-2, 144; becomes legalist, 166-79; ideals of, 170, 174; value of legalism, 178; poverty, 190. Of the Dispersion: how spread, 195-203; Jews and proselytes, 199-200, 212, 228; organization, 216-226.
Cicero, i. 33, 38, 53, 68, 79, 104.
Cilicia, iii. 4 sq.
Cilicium, iii. 4, 44.
Circumcision (proselytes of righteousness), i. 129; objection to, 129-30; Philo, 197; iii. 139; struggle over in Galatia, 163-81; not in Corinth, 267.
Claudia, ii. 19.
Claudius and Eleusinian mysteries, i. 80; befriends Jews, 136, 162, ii. 78-80; expels them, ii. 214; character, ii. 6, 17, 18, 75-7; accession, 58; venal ministers, 87; portents during his last year, iii. 214-5; ὁ κατέχων in 2 Thess., 215; death, iv. 77.
Claudius Felix, *v.* Felix.
Claudius Lysias, iv. 112, 115.
Cleanthes, i. 69, 150, 152.
Clement, iii. 206.
Clementine Homilies, ii. 105-7; iv. 124; Recognitions, 145, 205.
Cleopatra, wife of Philometor, ii. 71.
Collection, for poor of Jerusalem, iii. 173, 181, 187; in Corinth, iv. 42, 48-9, 65, 69, 107; in Colossæ, 120, 122, 267.
Colossæ, iii. 269.
Colossians, Ep., iv. 118, 119 note, 120, 122, 262.
Community of goods, ii. 134-9; becomes symbolic, 138.
Conversion, ii. 222; of Paul, iii. 55 sq.
Corban, ii. 182, 188; iv. 194, 196.
Corbulo, iv. 90, 125, 128, 178-9.
Corinth, iii. 175, 233-52; church, 248-52; heads of, iv. 68; Latin names at, iii. 236, 272; disturbances at, iv. 3-69; strange teachers, 4, 5, 12, 17; idols, 7-10; Palestinians, 18-9; religious excesses, 23-5; new opposition, 50-2; excommunication of a sinner, 44, 55-7, 61, 62, 64, 65.
Corinthians, 1st Ep., iii. 240, 249, 250, 271; iv. 28-42; occasion, 30; effect, 42.
Corinthians, 2nd Ep., iv. 47, 55-69.
Cornelius, son of Keren, ii. 182.
Costobar, iv. 192.
Cotys, of Lesser Armenia, ii. 87.
Crescens, iv. 139.
Crispus, iii. 241, 243.
Crispus Passienus, iv. 73.
Cross, humiliation of, ii. 148; iii. 64.
Ctesiphon, ii. 95.
Cumanus, iii. 173.
Cuspius Fadus, ii. 180-1; iv. 92-3.
Cybele, dangerous to Rome, i. 61; worship brought to Rome, 92-4.
Cyclopes, i. 68.
Cynædes, ii. 26.
Cynics, i. 23, 36, 47.
Cypros, ii. 20; friend to Pharisees, 82-3; iv. 19.
Cyprus, church in, iii. 142.
Cyrenaics, i. 23.

Dæmons, i. 58, 68; and the Logos, 150.
Damaris, iii. 232.
Damascus, ii. 95-6, 207; iii. 58, 72, 74; iv. 135.
Daniel, book of, i. 52; additions to, 143; end of world, ii. 60 sq.; Son of Man, 110, 153, iii. 60-1; abomination of desolation, iv. 232, 250, 275.
Deacons, ii. 137.
Delation, ii. 4, 13, 16.
Demas, iv. 117, 139.
Demeter, i. 76 sq.
Demetrius, friend of Seneca, i. 47.
Demetrius, historian, i. 115, 144.
Demetrius, alabarch, i. 162.
Demetrius, poet, iii. 6.
Demetrius, Ephesian, iii. 262.
Derbe, iii. 160-1, 187.
Diogenes, Epicurean, iii. 6.
Dionysiac rites, i. 81.
Dionysides, iii. 6.
Dionysius the Areopagite, iii. 232.
Dispersion, Jewish: religious mission of,

i. 101-23; position of Jews, 101; privileges, 101, 102, 106, 126, 135; commerce, 104; relation to Jerusalem, 105, 107; corporate life, 106-7; inter-connection, 107; aspirations, 108; how spiritualized, 109-10. Propaganda: under the name of Orpheus, 111; Sibyl, 112; Phocylides, 113; Aristeas, 114; Heraclitus, 115; classics, 115-6; by monotheism and Messianic hopes, 117 sq.; law reduced to humanitarianism, 118; unity preserved by Greek Bible, 142; in the East, ii. 93-6.
Domitia Lepida, iv. 73.
Dor, ii. 85.
Dositheus, ii. 71, 107.
Drusilla, Diva, ii. 37, 44.
Drusilla, Julia, ii. 37.
Drusilla, daughter of Herod Agrippa, ii. 92; iv. 96, 117, 121.
Drusus, ii. 6, 17-9; his son, 19.
Dualism, i. 23; of Plato, 50; in Alexandria, 146; of Paul, iii. 81-7; surmounted, 118; accentuated by contrast between Rome and Christianity, iv. 177-8.

Ecclesia, iii. 15.
Ecstasy, religious, in Corinth, iv. 23-5.
Egyptians, religion revives, i. 85-92; priests punished by Tiberius, 91, 134; attack Jews, 203; travesty of Jewish history, 203-4. In Bk. Wisdom, ii. 69.
Eleatics, i. 14 sq.
Eleazar (4 Maccabees), ii. 74.
Eleazar, son of Judas the Gaulonite, ii. 101; iv. 244.
Eleazar of Perœa, ii. 181.
Eleazar, Rabbi, i. 125; ii. 189; iii. 185.
Eleazar, son of Dinæus, iv. 93, 100.
Eleazar, son of Annas the younger, iv. 130, 135, 196-7.
Eleazar, son of Simon, iv. 201, 211, 231, 275.
Eleatics, i. 20.
Election, iii. 41.
Elephants, feast of, ii. 71.
Eliezar, Rabbi, on proselytes, ii. 199.
Elymas, iii. 142.
Enoch, book of, and asceticism, i. 52; iii. 38-40, 100-1.
Epœnetus, iii. 259.
Epaphras, iv. 118-9, 121, 166.
Epaphroditus, iii. 206, 227; iv. 165-6.
Epaphroditus (Nero's scribe), iv. 183.
Ephesians, Ep., iv. 118.
Ephesus, Baptists in, ii. 102; church in, 212-3, iii. 205, 217, 252-67, iv. 259.
Epictetus, i. 46, 49, 62.
Epicureanism, i. 37-8, 42, 46, 48, 65-6.
Erastus, iii. 244; iv. 68.
Eschatology, ii. 60 sq.; of Matthew, iv. 247-56, *v.* Apocalypse.
Essenes, ii. 101; iii. 111; described by Josephus, iv. 206-8, 246; tendencies towards in Christianity, iv. 22-3, 34.
Esther, supplement to, i. 143.
Ethics give way to morality, i. 35-6.
Euodia, iii. 206, 227, 272; iv. 165.
Eupolemus, i. 115, 144.
Euripides, on the gods, i. 17.
Eusebius, ii. 108, 189.
Euthydemus, iii. 6.
Eutychus, ii. 23.
Exodus, story invented by Egyptians, i. 203.
Ezekiel, prophecy of the end, ii. 61.
Ezra, book 4, ascetic traits, i. 55, 143.

Fadus, *v.* Cuspius.
Faenius Rufus, iv. 85, 169 note.
Fair Havens, iv. 141.
Faith, and works, ii. 230; righteousness by, iii. 27, 109.
Famine (the white horse), ii. 179-91; iii. 173.
Felix, Claudius, ii. 77, 92, 106, 180; iii. 173; iv. 94-6, 100, 115, 124-5.
Festus, iv. 126, 129, 187.
Flaccus, Pomponius, ii. 21.
Flaccus, Avilius, ii. 39-46.
Flesh is evil, iii. 42.
Florus, *v.* Gessius.
Fortunatus, ii. 28; iii. 240.
Francis, St., ii. 115; iii. 49.
Fulvia, i, 126, 134.

Gætulicus, *v.* Lentulus.
Gaius, iii. 211, 244; iv. 67.

Galatia, character, iii. 146-52; church, 152-63; circumcision, 164, 175; struggle in, 181-99; how far suited to Paul's teaching, 199.
Galba, iv. 180-3, 234, 274.
Gallio, iii. 238, 246-7; iv. 3, 75, 79, 84.
Gamaliel, i. 125; ii. 81-2, 146-7; iii. 31, 33; precepts, 34; iv. 205.
Games, heathen, ii. 85-91.
Gaza, church at, ii. 204.
Gentile customs, differently viewed by Jews of the Dispersion and Palestine, iii. 13-4; treatment by Paul, 139, 153-4, 164; first church among, 154-5; in Apocalypse, 253, 257; ii. 237; iv. 269.
Gerizim, ii. 10, 101, 105.
Germanicus, ii. 17.
Gessius Florus, iv. 187-8, 192-4.
Gishala, siege, iv. 228.
Gitta, ii. 106.
Gloves, a priest sacrifices in, ii. 91.
Gnosticism, and Philo, i. 173; among Samaritans, ii. 108; iii. 87.
Gog, ii. 61, 63, 236.
Greek, religion, i. 6 sq.; philosophical monotheism, i. 14 sq.; sophists, i. 16; gods supplanted by Eastern divinities, i. 84.

Hagar, iii. 11, 26, 156, 197-8.
Hananiah ben Nebedai, ii. 185.
Hananiah, Rabbi, ii. 189.
Hannibosheth, ii. 181.
Harmagedon, iv. 277.
Hebrew and Hellenist, ii. 156-8, 165.
Hebrews, Ep., ii. 104.
Hecatæus, i. 202.
Hedonism, i. 36.
Hegesippus, ii. 173.
Helena, i. 125; ii. 95, 189.
Helicon, ii. 26.
Heliodorus, iii. 8.
Helios, iv. 179.
Helkias, ii. 21, 53; iv. 130.
Hellenism, in Alexandria, i. 137 sq.; turns on the Greek Bible, 141-2; the Greek of the Bible, 143; unable to create religion, ii. 99, 240; under Caligula and Claudius, 195; Hellenists persecuted, 156 sq., 203; internal quarrels, 160 sq.
Hemerobaptists, ii. 102, 104.
Heracles, and Sardanapalus, iii. 5; in Platonists, i. 60.
Heraclitus, i. 15; Pseudo-, 115, iii. 255-7.
Heraclides, iii. 6.
Herennius Capito, ii. 22, 30, 38; brings on war, 39, 48, 204.
Hermogenes, iv. 164.
Herods, the, i. 135; ii. 5, 30.
Herod Agrippa, *v.* Agrippa.
Herod Antipas, *v.* Antipas.
Herod, elder, ii. 17.
Herod, Boethus, ii. 18.
Herod of Chalcis, ii. 79, 88, 182, 186 note; iv. 98.
Herodias, ii. 12, 17-8, 28, 30.
Hierapolis, iii. 269; iv. 119, 122.
Hieronymus, ii. 189; finds traces of Cilician dialect in Paul, iii. 9.
High-priesthood, not to be held twice, ii. 82; insignia of restored, ii. 182.
Hillel, i. 125; iii. 111, 133; precepts quoted by Paul, 191; iv. 4, 205.
Hindoos, i. 5.
Holy Spirit, iii. 84.
Horace, on Jews, i. 133; iv. 153, 155.
Hyrcanus, ii. 61.

Iconium, iii. 146, 156, 187, 205.
Idols, Paul's hatred of, iii. 7; iv. 7-10; meats offered to, 21 sq.
Immanent reason (world-soul), i. 49, 50, 149, 156; in Philo, 178.
Immortality, i. 29; among Greeks, 76, 80; in Egyptian rites, 87, 92.
Inspiration, Paul's doctrine of, iii. 24.
Irenæus, ii. 108.
Isaac, a Stoic ideal in Philo, i. 168.
Ishmael, son of Cantheras, ii. 187 note.
Ishmael ben Phabi, ii. 187 note; iv. 105, 126, 128, 130.
Isis, rites of, Tacitus' opinion, i. 61, 86-8; brought to Italy, 88, 90; repressed under Tiberius, 91, 134; patronised by Flavii, 91; view of thinkers, 92.
Italy, religion of, i. 10; destroyed by extent of Roman empire, 13.
Izates, i. 125, 129; ii. 95, 189; esp. iii. 185.

Jambres or Jamnes, iii. 143.
James, brother of the Lord, ii. 132; trial, 147, 172-7; iii. 172, 175; iv. 131-4.
James, son of Judas, ii. 101, 185.
James, son of Zebedee, ii. 131, 134, 167.
Jamnia, ii. 38, 205.
Jason of Cyrene, i. 155; iii. 211, 213, 217, 244; iv. 68.
Jeremiah, Ep. of, i. 115, 143.
Jerusalem, fortified, ii. 87, 115; visited by Jesus and his followers, 111 sq.; early Christian settlement, 127 sq.; to be scene of restoration of David's kingdom, 130; the twelve remain during persecution, 164; the high-priest's robes restored, 181-2; poverty, 190; siege, iv. 194-282.
Jesus Damnæi, iv. 192.
Jesus, son of Gamaliel, iv. 192, 201, 230.
Jesus, Justus, iv. 111.
Jesus of Tiberius, iv. 214.
Jewish Christianity, ii. 226-40; faith and works, 220; legalism, 231; like Pharisees, 232; Satan, 232-3, 235-6; approaching end, 234-5; future kingdom, 237-9; attitude towards Paul, iv. 18.
Jewish War, ii. 87; iv. 187-282; first insurrection, 187-200; how far desired, 189; effect of prophecy, 190; parties, 191-2; outbreak in Cæsarea, 193; in Jerusalem, 194-6.
Jews: influence of Judaism on Gentile cities, i. 124; immunities of, 126, 135; attacked by Tiberius, 126, 134; strengthened under Caligula and Claudius, 136; in Alexandria, 136-144; Hellenistic, ii. 99; in Philo, i. 198-200. Jews, the, as political agents, ii. 93; in Rome, iv. 145-156; numbers, 147, 173; quarters, 147, 173; versatility, 149; language, 150; ridicule, 151 (see also Horace, Juvenal, Ovid, Propertius and Tacitus); importance, 152-3. Attitude to Gentile proselytes, ii. 199, 200, 212, 228-9; iv. 154; blame for the burning of Rome diverted to Christians, 173.
Job, book of, considered uncanonical by Gamaliel, iii. 35.
Jochanan, ii. 182.
Johanan, ii. 117.
Joel, ii. 117.
John the Baptist, ii. 21, 101 sq., 113; not mentioned by Paul, as origin of Gospel, iii. 32-3.
John, of Gishala, iv. 214, 228, 230-1, 243, 245.
John Mark, ii. 132, 134; iii. 145, 164, 181, 253-4, 268; iv. 111, 122, 176, 256 sq.; iii. 172.
John, writer of Apocalypse, iii. 267-8.
John, son of Zebedee, iv. 133.
Jonathan, son of Annas, high-priest, ii. 10, 14; refuses re-appointment, 82, 163; iv. 94-5, 100.
Joppa, church at, ii. 206.
Joris, David, iii. 49.
Joseph, brother of the Lord, ii. 132.
Joseph Barsabas, ii. 132.
Joseph ben Camith, ii. 182, 185.
Joseph Cabi, iv. 131.
Joseph, son of Gorion, iv. 201.
Josephus, uses LXX., iii. 19; iv. 139, 158; life, and policy in Jewish War, 204-12; in Galilee, 212-25; hypocrisy, 217; 228; Pharisaism, 230-1; with Vespasian, 235, 238-41, 243.
Joses, Barnabas, ii. 133, 211.
Joshua ben Anan, iii. 39.
Joshua, prophetic, iv. 189.
Jotopata, iv. 219; siege, 220-5.
Jubilees, book of, iii. 22.
Judæa, situation under Vitellius, ii. 9 sq.; attacked by Arabs, 11; at accession of Nero, iv. 89-105.
Judaism, *v.* Jews.
Judas the Gaulonite, ii. 101; his sons, iv. 196-7, 244.
Judas, brother of the Lord, ii. 132.
Judas Iscariot, ii. 128.
Judas Lebbæus, ii. 131.
Judith, book of, ii. 94.
Julia Drusilla, ii. 37.
Justin Martyr, ii. 106-7, 223.
Justus, Titius, iii. 235; iv. 111.
Justus of Tiberias, iv. 209, 214-5.
Justification, iii. 36, 103-14.
Juvenal and the Jews, i. 131, 133; iv. 98, 145, 148-9 note, 154-5.

Kingdom, the, connection with belief in Jesus, ii. 109; Paul's conception of, iii. 114-21; how far shared in by converts (Thessalonica), iv. 17.

Laodicea, iii. 269, 273; iv. 119, 122, 267.
Law and sin, iii. 41; as the moral law in Paul, 80-1; Paul's relation to it, iv. 164; new conception of, iii. 88-95; compared to Hagar and Sinai, 156; how far binding, 167-8; observed by the Twelve, 171; in Ep. Gal. 194-8.
Lentulus Gætulicus, ii. 40.
Levi, *v.* Matthew.
Libertines, iv. 146.
Livia, ii. 19, 38, 40, 204.
Livilla, ii. 18-9.
Logos (in Philo), i. 59-60; origin, 141; at Alexandria, 148-50; of Stoics, 150-2; connected with Wisdom, 153-4, 179; in Philo, 171-189; Λόγος σπερματικὸς, 178; as mediator, 184-7; cf. Ep. Hebrews, 186; Logos and the Law, 189, 199-200; ii. 69-70; iii. 103; at Corinth, iv. 15.
Longinus, C. Cassius, ii. 179.
Love-feasts, iv. 26-7, 39-40.
Lucan, iv. 79.
Lucian, on the Eleusinian mysteries, i. 81.
Lucretius, i, 65.
Lucius, iii. 244; iv. 68; (Antioch) ii. 210.
Luke, iii. 205, 219; iv. 108, 117, 139, 143, 176.
Lycaonia, iii. 146.
Lydda, church in, ii. 206.
Lydia, iii. 206, 272.
Lysanias' territories given to Agrippa, ii. 25.
Lysias (Epicurean), iii. 6.
Lysias, Claudius, *v.* Claudius.
Lysimachus, i. 204.
Lystra, iii. 157-60, 187.

Maccabees, revolt inspired by Daniel, ii. 61.
Maccabees, Bk. ii. i. 155; Bk. iii. ii. 70; Bk. iv. i. 155, ii. 74.
Macedonia, iii. 203-8.
Macro, ii. 5, 7, 8, 26.
Malatha, ii. 210.
Malichus, iv. 218.
Manetho, i. 203-4.
Manhood, the new, iii. 103-14.
Marcellus, ii. 10.
Marcion, iii. 87.
Marcus Aurelius, i. 62.
Mariamne, ii. 17; the younger, ii. 17, 92.
Mark, *v.* John.
Marsus, C. Vibius, ii. 86-8, 179.
Marsyas, ii. 22, 25.
Martial, on Jews, i. 132-6, 197; iv. 147 note, 148-51.
Mary, mother of John Mark, ii. 89, 132, 135.
Matthew, ii. 131; apocalypse of, iv. 247-56; fairness to Rome, 256.
Matthias, son of Theophilus, iv. 192.
Matthias, son of Annas, ii. 82.
Matthias, Apostle, ii, 132.
Maximus, M., ii. 45.
Mediation, theology of, i. 64 sq.
Megarians, i. 3.
Melchizedek, iii. 28.
Melita, iv. 142.
Menahem, son of Judas the Gaulonite, ii. 101; iv. 196-7.
Menahem, founder of Syrian church, ii. 210.
Menander (Samaritan), ii. 108.
Messalina, i. 83; ii. 77; iv. 73.
Messiah, return of, why delayed, ii. 64; suffering, 148 sq.; as Daniel's Son of Man, iii. 61, 96; Paul's conception of, 95-103; and of the kingdom, 114-21.
Messiahs, Samaritan, iii. 56, *v.* Gerizim; iv. 101; Egyptian Jew, iv. 101-2, 128; Theudas, ii. 183; Menahem, 196-7, 250; Eleazar, 202, 250; others at the destruction of Jerusalem, 242; influence on Christianity, 247; Simon and John, 250; Vespasian, thus called by Josephus, 261; in Apocalypse, 275-6; warnings against, ii. 184.
Messiahship of Jesus, ii. 143, 156.
Messianic movement of John and Jesus lost in Nabatæan war, ii. 11, 101; followers of, 109-27; migrate to Jerusalem with Jesus, 111; as also the Galileans, 127 sq. (*v.* Theudas, 183, and Egyptian, 184).

Messianic expectations in Rome, i. 120.
Miletus, iii. 266-9.
Miracles, belief in, i. 56.
Mithra, Tacitus' view of, i. 61; enters Italy, 94.
Mnason, iii. 142; iv. 110.
Monism of Stoics, i. 150.
Monotheism, and dualism, i. 13; in Judaism as compared with worship of Osiris, Cybele and Mithra, 96-8; among proselytes, 130-1.
Morality, development of, i. 35.
Moses, identified with Musæus and Hermes, i. 116; as saviour, 189-201; treated by Paul in the light of Rabbinical tradition, iii. 23.
Mucianus, iv. 217, 233.
Mylitta, i. 4.
Myron, ii, 77.
Mysteries, i. 31, 75-83; Eleusinian brought to Italy, 50.
Mysticism, i. 51.
Mythology, i. 60.

Naarda, ii. 94-5.
Nabatæan war, ii. 11.
Naphia, battle of, ii. 71.
Naples, church in, ii. 215.
Narcissus, ii. 76; iv. 74, 76.
Narcissus of Ephesus, iii. 261.
Nathanael, ii. 152.
Nature-worship, i. 3, 61, 67-9; in mysteries, 81; among the Galatians, iii. 189.
Neapolis, iii. 205.
Neoplatonism, i. 58, 60.
Neopythagoreans, i. 53, 55-6, 145, 156.
Nero, ii. 19; iv. 3; life and government, 73-88; situation in Judæa under, 89-105, and 105-27; Christian persecution in Judæa, 127-35; in Rome, iii. 216, iv. 168-77; his end, 177-84; his return, origin of rumour, 184; expected, iii. 258, iv. 233; impostors, 260-1; in Apocalypse, 274, 277-8; in Suetonius, 282.
Nicolaitans, iii. 271; iv. 28, 37.
Nicolas, ii. 159; Nicolaos, iii. 271.
Nisibis, ii. 95.
Noachian ordinances, i. 128; iii. 267.
Nymphas, iii. 269; iv. 118.
Nymphidius, iv. 182.

Oblias, ii. 174.
Octavia, iv. 74-5, 86.
Olives, Mount of, and Egyptian Jew, iv. 102.
Omphale, iii. 7.
Onesimus, iv. 123.
Onesiphorus, iv. 164, 166.
Onias, ii. 71.
Oriental religions supplant Hellenic, i. 84.
Origen, ii. 107, 203.
Ormuzd, i. 4.
Orpheus, Jewish writings under his name, i. 111.
Orphic rites, i. 51, 81-2.
Osiris, i. 4, 86 sq., compared with Adonis cult, 87.
Otho, iv. 181, 233-4.
Ovid and the Jews, i. 133; iv. 154.

Pætus, iv. 128, 198.
Palestine, Christians in, ii. 99-191.
Pallas, ii. 76; iv. 76, 81, 87, 125-6.
Pamphylia, iii. 144.
Pantheism, Stoic, i. 66.
Parmenides, i. 22.
Parthians, iv. 89-90.
Passienus, iv. 73.
Patmos, iv. 265.
Paul, ii. 189; apocalyptic expectations, 196-8; sphere of work, 201-2; hatred of idols, iii. 7; Aramaic tongue, 8; early Hellenistic influences, 9, 10, 13 sq.; style, 11-2; education, 16 sq.; citizenship, 16, 205; books cited, 19-20. As Lawyer and Pharisee, 30 sq. first contact with Christianity, 32-3; relation to Gamaliel, 33; the Law, 41, 88-95; dualism, 42. Personal relations, 42-7; infirmity, 48-9, 264; visions, 59, 67. Conversion, 55-74; chronology of life, 55; a Zealot, 56 sq.; persecutes Stephen, 58; revelation of the Gospel, 63-4; the Cross, 64-5; the resurrection, 66. Attitude to historical origins, 70, 75-6. His theology a development of Jewish thought, 77-81. Speculative premisses, 82-87; comp. with Philo, 90.

The Messiah as Second Adam, 95-103. Regeneration, 103-13; Messianic kingdom, 114-21; cf. Platonic ideal world, 118-20. His religious genius, 121-6. Work in the East, 129-99. Paul as missionary, 129; to the Dispersion first, 129; eloquence, 131; personal influence, 134-5; methods, 136-40, 142, 182, 241; treatment of Gentiles, 139, 154, 164. In Antioch, 140-6; Cyprus, 142; Pamphylia, 144-5; Galatia, 146-63. Circumcision, 163-81; general validity of Law, 167-8, 176; conference at Jerusalem, 170-2, 174, 192-4. Struggle with Judaism, 156, 177-9; left unsettled in Galatia, 181-99; Ep. to Gal., 194-8. Work among the Greeks, 203. Macedonia, 203-28; Philippi, 205-8, 227-8; Thessalonica, 208-17, 219-26; Berœa, 218; Achaia, 228-252; Athens, 218, 228-33; Corinth, 233-52; affiliated churches, 247. Asia, 252-76; Ephesus, 252-66. Disturbances at Corinth, iv. 3-28; second visit, 11; Apollos, 12-7; idols, 21, 35, 37; religious excesses, 23-7, 39. First Ep. to the Corinthians, 28-42; the future of Christianity, 33; marriage, 34-5, 38; worship, 37; women, 37-8; love-feasts and Eucharist, 39. Struggle over the Apostolate, 42-55. Second Ep. to the Corinthians, 55-69; his own apostolate, 58-60; revulsion of feeling, 62-4; further conference at Jerusalem necessary, 68. Danger from Zealots, 101. Paul in Judæa, 105-27; journey, 107-10; repulsed by Peter and James, 110-11; arrest and trial, 112-27. In Rome, 139-176. Journey, 139-46. Roman Christians, 156-68; special dangers in Rome, 163. View of Nero's excesses, 169; death, 176.

Paula Veturia, i. 133; iv. 154.

Paulus, Sergius, iii. 142.

Pausanius, ii. 189.

Pella, iii. 73; iv. 247 note, 254.

Pentecost, miracle of, ii. 116-23, 129.

Perga, iii. 144-5, 161.

Pergamus, iii. 269-70.

Persecution of Jews, at Alexandria, ii. 39-50; temple endangered, 50, 58; by Philopator, 71; Greek and Samaritan, 89; in Mesopotamia, 95; at outbreak of Jewish War, iv. 198-200.

Persecution of Christians, by Herod, ii. 86; of Hellenists, 156-66, 203; of new churches, 221; under Claudius, 214; Nero, 215; and in Judæa, iv. 127-35; in Rome, 168-77. During the war, 248-9.

Persian religion, i. 4.

Peter, ii. 131, 168; iii. 125, 172, 175-7.

Petra, ii. 11.

Petronius, ii. 51 sq., 85-93.

Pharisees, and proselytes, i. 125; and Agrippa, ii. 81-7, 166-79; oppose Messiahship of Jesus, 146-7; urged on by Roman mistakes, 169; and the Church, iii. 169. Moral depravity of, iv. 217.

Philadelphia, ii. 95; iii. 269-70.

Philemon, Ep., iv. 118, 122.

Philemon and Baucis, iii. 159.

Philip, ii. 105, 133-4, 151, 159, 204, 206; iv. 109.

Philip, tetrachy of, ii. 11, 13, 15, 25, 27.

Philippi, iii. 205-8, 219, 227-8; iv. 164-5.

Philippians, Ep., iv. 162 note, 164-8.

Philo, i. 57, 59; treatment of Mosaism, 160; life, 161-6; religion, 167; philosophic methods, 167; writings, 168-70; Doctrine of the Logos, 170-89. Moses as bringing Salvation, 189 sq.; the Law and Stoicism, 193.—ii. 3, 6, 8, 11, 40, 42, 44-7; interview with Caligula, 49; 117.—iii. 61; doctrine of the Second Adam, 97-8 (in Paul, 99-101).—Resists Cæsar-worship, iv. 276.

Philosophy, a preparation for religion, i. 61.

Philostratus, i. 54; iii. 6.

Phocylides, pseudo-, i. 113.

Phœbe, iii. 235, 245, 260.

Phœnicians, i. 4, 8.

Phygellus, iv. 164.

Physcon, ii. 71.

Pilate, ii. 4, 10, 105; iii. 56.

Piso, ii. 19; iv. 85-6, 179.

Plato, i. 26, 36; contempt for nature, 56-9; his doctrine of the fall of the soul corresponds with Genesis, 145; his mono-

theism introduces Jews to Hellenism, 146.
Platonic schools, i. 29, 145.
Platonism in Paul, iii. 28, 99-101; in Philo, 61, 98.
Plutarch, i. 33, 45, 48, 55, 58, 78; iii. 5.
Plutiades, iii. 6.
Polemon of Pontus, ii. 88; iv. 98.
Polybius, ii. 77.
Polytheism, i. 3 sq.
Poppæa, influence on the government, iv. 81, 85, 91, 188; her friendship to the Jews, i. 132, iv. 83, 129, 154, 174; to Josephus, iv. 158, 210.
Posides, ii. 77.
Posidonius and Jews, i. 204.
Predestination, iii. 111.
Priscilla, ii. 213-4; *v.* also Aquila.
Proof from Scripture, ii. 149, 156; of the servant of Jehovah, 150.—iii. 52, 63-6, 76.
Propertius and Jews, i. 90; and Athens, iii. 230, 236.
Proselytes, i. 123-34; numbers, 124, 130; eagerness to make them, 125-6; of the gate and of righteousness, 126, 129, 131; obligations, 127-9, ii. 212, 227-9; privileges, i. 128; mostly women, 129; dislike of among statesmen, 131; Rabbis, 125, 130, ii. 199; the 'gate' constitute a monotheistic church at Rome, i. 132-3; dealt with by Tiberius, 134.
Proselytism, the usual course of, iii. 185.
Ptolemais, ii. 52, 206.
Ptolemy Philopator, ii. 71.
Puteoli, iv. 144.
Pyrrho, i. 40.
Pythagoras, i. 51-5; compared to Moses, 145.

Quadratus, iv. 94, 125.
Quartus, iii. 244.
Quirinius, census of, iv. 188.

Rabbinical tradition, iii. 22; additions to parable, ii. 140.
Redemption, need for, i. 46-63; iii. 42.
Regeneration, iii. 103-14.
Religion defined, i. 3; religion of the world, how determined, 61-3.
Resurrection, ii. 110; basis of belief in, 111-13; in case of the Baptist, Elias, &c., 114; vision hypothesis, 114; how viewed by Paul, iii. 108, 119-20; the question at Corinth, iv. 17.
Rhea, i. 92.
Rhegma, iii. 4.
Rhoda, ii. 132.
Roman Empire, position of religious life in, i. 3 sq.; deities, 10 sq.
Romans, Ep., iii. 238, 260; iv. 67-8.
Rome, Jews in, iv. 145; church in, ii. 213-5, iv. 156 sq.; ascetic and Judaistic, 156-7. Paul's journey to Rome, iv. 139-46; dangers in, 163. Blame for great fire shifted from Jews to Christians, 173-4. Doom of Rome in Apocalypse, 277-8.
Rufus, son of Simon of Cyrene, ii. 132, 211.

Saccæa, iii. 7.
Sacrifice, iii. 105 sq.
Sacrificial death of the Messiah not Pauline, ii. 229.
Salome, ii. 131.
Salome, daughter of Herodias, ii. 18, 21, 30, 204.
Salome, the elder, ii. 38.
Samaria, ii. 106; church in, 203; Messianic movements in, ii. 10, 105-9, iii. 56; Chronicles, ii. 107; rebels against Pharisees, 44, 167.
Sampsiceramus of Emesa, ii. 87.
Sandan, iii. 5, 7, 10.
Sanhedrin, admits scribes, ii. 82.
Sarah, iii. 26, 197-8.
Saramalla, i. 104, 161; ii. 210.
Sardanapalus, iii. 5, 7.
Sardis, iii. 274.
Saul (son of Boethus), iv. 192, 196.
Scepticism, i. 37, 39, 65-6.
Sceva, iii. 261.
Scripture, interpretation of, iii. 25 sq.
Secundus, iii. 211, 266.
Sejanus, i. 205; ii. 4, 18.
Seleucia, ii. 95.
Seleucus Nicator, ii. 209.
Semiramus, iii. 7.
Seneca, i. 33, 37-8, 41-3; his asceticism,

48-9; natural philosophy, 70-1; on slavery, ii. 225.—iv. 75, 77-82, 84-5, 89, 99; persecutes Christians, 175-6, 193.
Sephela, ii. 48.
Sepphoris, iv. 219.
Septuagint, i. 141-3; used by Paul and Josephus, iii. 19.
Sergius Paulus, iii. 142.
Servant of Jehovah, ii. 149.
Sextians, i. 53.
Sextus Empiricus, i. 40.
Shammai, iii. 33 sq.
Shechinah, iii. 23.
Sheol, ii, 113.
Sibyl, Jewish, i. 112, 119; ref. in Virgil, 120; cited, 202; ii. 61; iii. 61, 97; new Apocalypse in, iv. 281.
Sidon, ii. 88.
Silanus, ii. 8, 26.
Silas, ii. 84, 133-4; iv. 4.
Silas of Babylon, iv. 201.
Silius, ii. 19.
Siloam, iii. 56.
Simon Cantheras, ii. 82, 182.
Simon bar Giora, iv. 231, 243-5, 277.
Simon, son of Annas, iv. 196.
Simon, son of Gamaliel, i. 125.
Simon, son of Judas the Gaulonite (leads expedition to Gerizim), ii. 101, 105, 185, 204.
Simon Magus, in Josephus and Acts, ii. 106; represents Paul, iii. 87, 260, 262; iv. 96, 110, 124.
Simon Peter, *v.* Peter.
Sin, sense of, i. 34; its nature, ii. 88; relation to law, 91-3, and Christ, 104; atoned for, 105.
Sinai, ii. 118; iii. 11, 72-3, 156, 198.
Slavery and Christianity, ii. 224-6; and Seneca, 225.
Smyrna, iii. 269.
Socrates, i. 19-20, 23, 34.
Socratic schools, i. 20, 37.
Sohem, ii. 79; iv. 218.
Son of Man, use of the term by Jesus, ii. 110-12, iii. 60; in Enoch, 100-1; in Apocalypse, iv. 276.
Song of the Lamb, ii. 220.
Sopater, iii. 219, 226.
Sophists, iii. 6, 7.
Sosia Galla, ii. 19.
Sosipater, iii. 244; iv. 68.
Sosthenes, iii. 246, 261; ruler of synagogue, iii. 247.
Spirit, differentiation between Christians and Baptists, ii. 120, 121-6, 142, 207, 233; iii. 83 sq., 107.
Spiritual body, iii. 113.
Stephanas, ii. 226; iii. 240.
Stephen, ii. 133-4, 159-63; iii. 57.
Sychem, ii. 90.
Symbolism, iii. 26 sq.
Synagogue in the Dispersion, the starting-point of the church, iii. 231, 241.
Syntyche, iii. 206, 227, 272; iv. 165.
Syria, ii. 95, 203 sq.
Syzygus, iii. 206, 227; iv. 165.

Tabernacles, feast of, parodied by Saccæa, iii. 7.
Tabitha, ii. 206.
Tacitus, ii. 5; on Jews, iv. 155; on Christian persecutions, 176.
Tallith, ii. 218.
Talmud, ii. 81, 83, 90, 94.
Tarichæa, iv. 227.
Tarsus, iii. 4 sq.; close connection with Jerusalem, 8; Iconium, &c., 146; gives aid in Jewish War, iv. 200.
Taurus, iii. 4.
Temple, Caligula's attack on, ii. 50-8; defilement necessary before advent of Messiah, 62-4, 66, iii. 8; tax for, ii. 227; Paul's early devotion to, iii. 57; doomed when a square, iv. 197; believed to be inviolable, 264-5, 271.
Tertius, iii. 244; iv. 68.
Tertullian, ii. 223.
Tertullus, iv. 115.
Thaumastus, ii. 24, 84.
Thekla, iii. 157.
Theocracy restored, ii. 75-93.
Theophilus (son of Annas), ii. 14, 52; deposed, 82, 164.
Thessalonians, 1st Ep., iii. 213, 220, 239.
Thessalonians, 2nd Ep., iii. 215, 239.
Thessalonica, iii. 208-19, 226, 233, 239.
Theudas, ii. 147, 183, 188.
Thucydides, history and religion, i. 18.

Thyatira, iii. 206, 269, 272.
Tiberias, ii. 20.
Tiberius, Philo's judgment on, ii. 3.
Tiberius Alexander, ii. 70; procurator, 185-6; iv. 92, 237.
Tiberius Gemellus, ii. 6 sq., 24, 26.
Tigellinus, iv. 85-6, 88, 91, 152, 168-9, 181-2.
Tigranes, iv. 90, 128.
Timotheus, iii. 160-1, 182-3, 205, 218, 225, 243-4, 246, 259; iv. 4, 29, 62, 108, 117, 139, 166-7, 176.
Timotheus, 1st Ep. to, iii. 259.
Timotheus, 2nd Ep. to, iii. 200; iv. 162 note, 164.
Tirathaba, ii. 101, 106, 204.
Tiridates, ii. 9, 13, 15; iv. 89, 91.
Titius Justus, iii. 235; his house, 248.
Titus, ii. 92; iii. 170-2, 175, 226, 246; iv. 48-9, 62-5, 139.
Titus, emperor, iv. 217, 223, 225; and Bernice, 226, 234; prophecy of Josephus, 225; of Paphian Venus, 234, 245.
Tobit, book of, ii. 94.
Tolmai, ii. 181.
Tongues, gift of, ii. 117, 121 sq., 219; in Isaiah, 121; dangers of, 125; in Corinth, iv. 24.
Trachonitis, ii. 90.
Tres Tabernæ, iv. 145.
Troas, iii. 205, 269.
Trophimus, iv. 108, 112.
Tryphæna, ii. 182; iii. 261.
Tychicus, iv. 108, 117-20, 124, 139.
Types, iii. 27-9.
Tyrannus, iii. 260.

Unlearned, seat of the, i. 128; ii. 220-1.

Ventidius Cumanus, ii. 186; iv. 92, 95.
Verginius Rufus, iv. 180, 233, 277.
Vespasian, iv. 179, 199, 217; Josephus' prophecy to, 225; 232-7, 245, 261, 277.
Vibius Marsus, ii. 86-8.
Vicarious suffering, ii. 156.
Vindex, iv. 180.
Virgil and the Sibyl, i. 120-1.
Vision-hypothesis of resurrection, ii. 114-6. Vision of the 500 the nucleus of Pentecost miracle, 119. Visions of Paul, iii. 48, 59, 169, 203, 243.
Vitellius, in Judæa, ii. 9-16, 21, 29, 164; campaign against the Clitæ, iii. 149; emperor, iv. 233-4, 236, 277; consideration for the Jews, ii. 10, 14, 105, iii. 56, 74; flatters Caligula, ii. 36.
Vologæses, iv. 89; and memory of Nero, 184 and 260, 277.

Wars, and rumours of wars, ii. 12; iv. 268.
Wisdom, Book of, i. 118, 148, 152-5; ii. 67-70.
Wisdom personified in Alexandrian philosophy, i. 146-8.
Wise, the, and the Gospel, iv. 32.
Women and Christianity, ii. 224; in Corinthian Church, iv. 25-6, 37-8.
Word, or Logos, ii. 69-70.
Works and faith, ii. 230.
World-soul, of Stoics, i. 49-50, 66.

Xenophanes, on Homeric gods, i. 9; on pure being, 14; on Egyptian gods, 85.

Zacharias, son of Baruch, iv. 230.
Zealots and Pharisees, ii. 86, 101; try to kill Paul, iv. 101; and Jesus, 132; 191, 232, 241; ready to join Nero as Antichrist, 261.
Zeno, i. 22, 178; the Stoic, iii. 6.
Zeus and Semele, Io, &c., i. 6 sq.; in Plato, i. 29; in the Stoics, 67, 70; supplanted by Oriental gods in 1st century, 84.

C. Green & Son, Printers, 178, Strand.

Bethel Seminary of the East
Libraries
1 (888) THE EAST

BS 2407 .H3713 v.4
Hausrath, Adolf, 1837-1909.
A history of the New Testament times

BS 2407 .H3713 v.4
Hausrath, Adolf, 1837-1909.
A history of the New Testament times

DATE	ISSUED TO

Denver Seminary Library
Washington DC Extension
1st Bapt Church Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414